This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

BRARIES
0232 8

James Chrystal.

Estate of Rev James Chrystal

April 6 '09

Brigham

Z C

THE WORKS

OF

THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

EDITED BY

HIS LINEAL DESCENDANT

THE REV. R. BINGHAM, JUN., M.A.

FORMERLY OF MAGDALENE HALL, OXFORD,

AND

FOR MANY YEARS CURATE OF TRINITY CHURCH, GOSPORT.

A NEW EDITION, IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. VII.

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

OXFORD:

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

1855.

M.DCCC.LV.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
506436
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1910 L

CONTENTS

OF THE

SEVENTEENTH, EIGHTEENTH, NINETEENTH, TWENTIETH, AND TWENTY-FIRST BOOKS

OF

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK XVII.

OF THE EXERCISE OF DISCIPLINE UPON THE CLERGY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the difference of ecclesiastical censures inflicted on clergymen and laymen.

SECT. I. The peculiar notion of communion ecclesiastical, and excommunication ecclesiastical, as applied to the clergy, 1.—II. The clergy usually punished by a removal from their office, but not always subjected to public penance, as men wholly cast out of the communion of the Church, 3.—III. Yet in some special cases both penalties inflicted, 4.—IV. Of suspension from their revenues, 5.—V. Of suspension from their office, 6.—VI. Of deposition or degradation, 7.

CHAPTER II.

Of reducing the clergy to the state and communion of laymen, as a punishment for great offences.

SECT. I. Lay-communion not the same as communion in one kind only, 8.—II. Neither does it signify barely communicating among laymen without the rails of the chancel, 10.—III. But a total degradation, or deprivation of orders, and reduction to the state and condition of laymen, 10.—IV. Clergymen thus reduced seldom allowed to recover their ancient station, 12.—V. Notwithstanding the indelible character of ordination, 13.—VI. But sometimes excommunicated, as well as deposed, and denied the communion of laymen, 16.—VII. Sometimes removed and corrected by the assistance and authority of the secular power, 17.—VIII. What meant by the punishment called *curiæ tradi*, or delivering up to the secular court, 17.

CHAPTER III.

Of the punishment called Peregrina Communio, or reducing clergymen tc the communion of strangers.

SECT. I. The several canons wherein this punishment is mentioned, 21.-II. The communion of strangers not the same as lay-communion, 22.-III. Nor communion in one kind, 23.—IV. Nor communion at tl hour of death, 23.—V. Nor the communion of such as were enjoine to go on pilgrimage on earth, which was a piece of discipline unknow to the Ancients, 24.—VI. Nor any private and peculiar oblation fc strangers, 25.—VII. But communicating only as strangers travellin without commendatory letters, who might partake of the Church charity; but not of the communion of the altar, 25.—VIII. Th notion confirmed from several parts of ancient history, 29.—IX. Wh sort of penance was necessary to restore such delinquent clergymen t their office and station again, 30.

CHAPTER IV.

Of some other special and peculiar ways of inflicting punishment on the clergy.

SECT. I. Sometimes the clergy perpetually suspended from their offic yet allowed to retain their title and dignity, 33.—II. Sometimes d graded not totally, but partially, from one order to another, 35.—II Sometimes deprived of a part of their office, but allowed to exercise tl rest, 36.—IV. Sometimes deprived of their power over a part of the flock, but allowed it over the rest, 36.—V. Bishops in Afric punishe by depriving them of their seniority, and right of succeeding to tl primacy or metropolitical power, 37.—VI. Also by confining them t the communion of their own Church, 37.—VII. Or by removing the from a greater diocese to a lesser, 38.—VIII. The clergy in gener punished by a loss of their seniority among those of their own orde 39.—IX. The inferior clergy punished by rendering them incapable being promoted to any higher order, 40.—X. The clergy sometim punished by denying them the public exercise of their office, whil they were allowed to officiate in private, 42.—XI. Of intrusion offenders into a monastery to do penance in private, 43.—XII. Of co poral punishment. How far used as a piece of discipline upon tl inferior clergy, 44.

CHAPTER V.

A particular account of the crimes for which clergymen were liable to be punished with any of the forementioned kinds of censure.

SECT. I. All crimes that were punished with excommunication in a la man, punished with suspension or deprivation in the clergy, 46.—I Some crimes rendered an ordination originally void: and for such crim the clergy were immediately liable to be degraded from the very m ment of their ordination; as, first, for ignorance or heterodoxy in rel gion, 47.—III. Secondly, for great immorality before their ordinatio

and for being ordained against any of the known rules of ordination. As, if he were a digamist, or married to a widow, or to one that had been divorced from another man. If he were ordained ἀπολελυμένως, without being fixed to some particular diocese. If he were ordained without letters dimissory against the consent of his own bishop; or without the consent of any of the parties that had a right to vote in his election. If any bishop was ordained, who had before been degraded from his orders. Or if he was ordained into a full see, where another was regularly ordained before him. If any was an energumen, or under the agitation of an evil spirit, when he was ordained. If any had voluntarily mangled his own body; if any one was ordained who had never been baptized, or not baptized in due form, or was baptized by heretics, or re-baptized by them; if any made use of the secular powers to gain a promotion in the Church; if a bishop ordained any of his own unworthy kindred; if a bishop clandestinely ordained his own successor without the consent of the metropolitan or a provincial council; or if two bishops clandestinely ordained a bishop without the consent of their fellow bishops and the metropolitan: in all these cases the clergy so ordained were liable to be deposed for transgressing the rules of ordination, 48.—IV. No remedy allowed in this case by doing public penance for offences. For all public penitents were for ever incapable of ordination. And if any such were ordained, they were immediately liable to be deposed and degraded, 55.—V. Some impediments of ordination arising from men's outward state and condition in the world were also sometimes occasions of deprivation. As, if any soldier was ordained, or any slave or vassal without the consent of his master; or any member of a civil corporation, or any of the curiales in the Roman government, 57.—VI. What crimes might occasion the deprivation of the clergy, or other censures to befal them, in the performance of their office, or rather non-performance of it after ordination. Clergymen to be censured for contempt of the canons in general, 58.—VII. More particularly for negligence in their duty, 59.—VIII. For neglecting to use the public liturgy, Lord's Prayer, hymns, &c., 59.—IX. For making any alteration in the form of baptism, 60.—X. For not frequenting divine service daily, 61.—XI. For meddling with secular offices, 61.—XII. For deserting their own church without license, to go to another, 63.—XIII. For officiating after the condemnation of a synod, 64.—XIV. For appealing from the censure of a provincial synod to any foreign Churches, 64.—XV. For refusing to end controversies before bishops, and flying to a secular tribunal, 65.—XVI. For suffering themselves to be re-baptized or re-ordained, 69.—XVII. For denying themselves to be clergymen, 70.—XVIII. For publishing apocryphal books, 70.—XIX. For superstitious abstinence from flesh, wine, &c. 71.—XX. For eating of blood, 72.—XXI. For contemning the fasts or festivals of the Church, 73.—XXII. For not observing the rules about Easter, 74.—XXIII. For wearing an indecent habit, 75.—XXIV. For keeping hawks or hounds, and following any unlawful diversions, 76.—XXV. For suspicious co-

habitation with strange women, 78.—XXVI. For marrying after ordination, 79.—XXVII. For retaining an adulterous wife, 80.—XXVIII. For non-residence, 81.—XXIX. For attempting to hold preferment in two dioceses, 82.—XXX. For needless frequenting of public inns and taverns, 83.—XXXI. For conversing familiarly with Jews, heretics, or Gentile philosophers, 83.—XXXII. For using over-rigorous severity towards lapsers, 84.—XXXIII. For want of charity to indigent clergymen in their necessity, 84.—XXXIV. For judging in cases of blood, 85.—XXXV. Crimes for which bishops in particular might be suspended or degraded. For giving ordinations contrary to the canons, 86.—XXXVI. For neglecting to put the laws of discipline in execution, 87.—XXXVII. For dividing their diocese, and erecting new bishoprics without leave. Or for extending their claim to other men's rights beyond their own limits and jurisdiction, 88.—XXXVIII. For not attending provincial Councils, 89.—XXXIX. For oppressing the people with unjust exactions, 90.—XL. For harbouring such as fled from another diocese without leave, 90.—XLI. *Chorepiscopi* might be censured for acting beyond their commission, 91.—XLII. And presbyters for usurping upon the episcopal office, 91.—XLIII. And deacons for assuming offices and privileges above their order and station, 92.

BOOK XVIII.

OF THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF PENITENTS, AND THE METHOD OF PERFORMING PUBLIC PENANCE IN THE CHURCH, BY GOING THROUGH THE SEVERAL STAGES OF REPENTANCE.

CHAPTER I.

A particular account of the several orders of penitents in the Church.

SECT. I. Penitents divided into four distinct orders or stations, 94.—II. The first original of this distinction, 95.—III. Of the first order, called *flentes*, or *mourners*, 96.—IV. Of the second order called *audientes*, or *hearers*, 98.—V. Of the third order, called *prostrators*, or *kneelers*, and penitents in the strictest sense, 99.—VI. Of the fourth order called *consistentes*, or *co-standers*, 100.

CHAPTER II.

Of the ceremonies used in admitting penitents to do public penance, and the manner of performing public penance in the Church.

SECT. I. Penitents first admitted to penance by imposition of hands, 102.—II. At which time they were obliged to appear before the bishop with sackcloth and ashes upon their heads. This ceremony anciently not confined to Ash-Wednesday, or the beginning of Lent, but persons were admitted to penance at any time, as the bishop judged most proper in his

own discretion, 102.—III. Penitents obliged to cut off their hair, or go veiled, as another token of sorrow and mourning, 106.—IV. Penitents to abstain from bathing and feasting, and other innocent diversions of life, 108.—V. Penitents to observe all the public fasts of the Church, 109.—VI. Penitents to restrain themselves in the use of the conjugal state, 109.—VII. For which reason no married persons were admitted to penance, but by consent of both parties, 109.—VIII. Penitents not allowed to marry in the time of their penance, 110.—IX. Penitents obliged to pray kneeling, whilst others prayed standing, on all festivals and days of relaxation, 110.—X. Penitents obliged to show great liberality to the poor, 111.—XI. And to minister and serve the Church in burying the dead, 111.

CHAPTER III.

A particular account of the Exomologesis, or Penitential Confession of the ancient Church; shewing it to be a different thing from the private or auricular confession introduced by the Church of Rome.

SECT. I. The gross mistake of those who make the *exomologesis* of the ancient Church to signify auricular confession, 112.—II. No necessity of auricular confession ever urged by the ancient Church, 115.—III. This proved further from the practice of the Ancients in denying all manner of absolution to some relapsing sinners, without excluding them from the mercy and pardon of God, upon confession to him alone, 121. —IV. And from above twenty considerations of the like nature, 125.—V. Yet private confession allowed and encouraged in some cases.—As first, for lesser sins, men were advised mutually to confess to one another, to have each other's prayers and assistance, 129.—VI. Secondly, in case of injuries done to private persons, men were obliged to confess, and ask pardon of the injured party, 132.—VII. Thirdly, when they were under any troubles of conscience they were advised to make private confession to a minister, to have his counsel and direction, 132.—VIII. Fourthly, to take his advice also, whether it was proper to do public penance for private offences, 133.—IX. Fifthly, when there was any danger of death arising from the laws of the State against certain offences, 136.—X. Sixthly, private confession was also required in case of private admonition for offences, 137.—XI. The office of the penitentiary priest set up in many Churches to receive and regulate such private confessions, 137.—XII. This office was afterwards abrogated in the East by Nectarius, and men were left to their liberty as to what concerned private confession, 138.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the great rigour, strictness, and severity of the discipline and penance of the ancient Church.

SECT. I. Public penance ordinarily allowed but once to any sort of sinners, 141.—II. Some sinners held under a strict penance all their lives to the very hour of death, 145.—III. Such as were absolved upon a

death-bed were obliged to perform their ordinary penance if they recovered, 147.—IV. Some sinners were denied communion at their last hour, 150.—V. How this may be vindicated and cleared from the charge of Novatianism, 155.—VI. This rigour abated in after-ages, without any reflection on the preceding practice, 158.—VII. What liberty was allowed to bishops in imposing of penance, and exacting proper satisfaction of sinners. Some sinners allowed to do penance twice, 160.—VIII. Bishops had also power to moderate the term of penance upon just occasion, 162.—IX. And this was the true ancient notion of an indulgence, 163.—X. Which was sometimes granted at the intercession of the martyrs or the instance of the civil magistrate, 163. —XI. Bishops had also a power to alter the nature of the penalty in some measure, as well as the term of it, 165.—XII. What the Ancients mean by the term, *legitima pœnitentia*, 166.—XIII. What meant by the phrase, *inter hyemantes orare*, 166.

BOOK XIX.

OF ABSOLUTION, OR THE MANNER OF READMITTING PENITENTS INTO THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH AGAIN.

CHAPTER I.

Of the nature of absolution, and the several sorts of it: more particularly of such as relate to the penitential discipline of the Church.

SECT. I. All church-absolution only ministerial, not absolute, 171.—II. Of the grand absolution of baptism. That this was of no use in penitential discipline to persons once baptized, 174.—III. Of the absolution granted by the eucharist, 178.—IV. Of absolution declaratory and effective by the administration of the word and doctrine, 181.—V. Of the precatory absolution given by imposition of hands and prayer, 182.—VI. Of the judicial absolution of penitents by restoring them to the peace and full communion of the Church, 186.

CHAPTER II.

Of the circumstances, rites, and customs anciently observed in the public absolution of sinners.

SECT. I. No sinners anciently absolved till they had performed their regular penance, except in case of imminent death, 188.—II. Penitents publicly reconciled in sackcloth at the altar, 190.—III. Sometimes more publicly before the *apsis*, or reading-desk, 191.—IV. Absolution at the altar always given in a supplicatory form by imposition of hands and prayer, 192.—V. Absolution in the indicative form, *Ego te absolvo*, not used till the twelfth century, 198.—VI. In what sense that form may be allowed, 198.—VII. Why chrism or unction was sometimes added

to imposition of hands in the reconciliation of certain heretics and schismatics to the Church, 201.—VIII. Why some heretics could be reconciled no other way but by a new baptism, 205.—IX. What conditions were required of those who fell from the Church into any heresy or schism, when they were reconciled to the Church again, 206. —X. Of the time of absolution, 208.—XI. How the Church absolved some penitents, and received them into communion after death, 209.

CHAPTER III.

Of the minister of ecclesiastical discipline, and particularly of the minister of absolution.

SECT. I. All the power of discipline primarily lodged in the hands of the bishop, 212.—II. This in many cases committed to presbyters, either by a general or particular commission, 212.—III. And to deacons also, 214.—IV. How far, and in what sense, absolution might be said to be given by a layman, 215.

BOOK XX.

OF THE FESTIVALS OBSERVED IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the distinction to be made between civil and ecclesiastical festivals.

SECT. I. What meant by the civil festivals, 221.—II. Of the *feriæ æstivæ*, or thirty days of vacation in the harvest month, and the *feriæ autumnales*, 222.—III. Of the kalends of January, 225.—IV. Of the emperors' birthdays, 228.—V. Of the *natales urbium*, or the two *feriæ* in memory of the foundation of Rome and Constantinople, 230.

CHAPTER II.

Of the original and observation of the Lord's-day among Christians.

SECT. I. The Lord's-day of continued observation in the Church from the days of the Apostles, under the names of Sunday, the Lord's-day, the first day of the week, and the day of breaking bread, &c., 232.—II. All proceedings at law forbidden and suspended on this day, except such as were of absolute necessity or great charity: as manumission of slaves, &c., 236.—III. All secular business forbidden, except such as necessity or charity compelled men to, as gathering of their fruits in harvest, by some laws, 239.—IV. No public games, or shows, or ludicrous recreations allowed on this day, 248.—V. All fasting prohibited on this day, even in the time of Lent, 254.—VI. And all prayers offered in the standing posture on the Lord's-day, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection, 258.—VII. The great care and concern of the primitive Christians in the religious observation of the Lord's-day. This demon-

strated, first, from their constant attendance upon all the solemnities of public worship, 258.—VIII. Secondly, from their zeal in frequenting religious assemblies, even in times of persecution, 259.—IX. Thirdly, from their studious observation of the vigils, or nocturnal assemblies preceding the Lord's-day, 261.—X. Fourthly, from their attendance upon sermons in many places twice on this day, 261.—XI. Fifthly, from their attendance on evening prayers, where there was no sermon, 262.—XII. Sixthly, from the censures inflicted on those who violated the laws concerning the religious observation of the Lord's-day, 264.

CHAPTER III.

Of the observation of the Sabbath or Saturday as a weekly festival.

SECT. I. The Saturday, or Sabbath, always observed in the Eastern Church as a festival, 266.—II. Observed with the same religious solemnities as the Lord's-day, 268.—III. But in some other respects the preference was given to the Lord's-day, 269.—IV. Why the ancient Church continued the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, 271.—V. Why it was kept as a festival in the Oriental Church, 272.—VI. And why a fast in the Roman, and some other of the Latin Churches, 274.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the Festival of Christ's Nativity and Epiphany.

SECT. I. The Nativity of Christ anciently by some said to be in May, 279. —II. By others fixed to the day of Epiphany, or sixth of January, 280. —III. In the Latin Church always observed on the twenty-fifth of December, 284.—IV. The original of this festival derived from the apostolical age by some ancient writers, 285.—V. This festival observed with the same religious veneration as the Lord's-day, 287.—VI. Of Epiphany as a distinct festival, 292.—VII. Why this day called by some the Second Epiphany, and *Dies Luminum, the Day of Lights*, 294.—VIII. Celebrated as all other great festivals, and in one respect more noted, as being in the Greek Church one of the three solemn times of baptism, 295.—IX. Notice usually given on Epiphany concerning the time of Easter in the ensuing year, 297.

CHAPTER V.

Of Easter, or the Paschal Festival.

SECT. I. The Paschal solemnity anciently reckoned fifteen days, the whole week before and the week after Easter Sunday, 299.—II. Great disputes in the Church concerning this festival, some observing it on a fixed day every year, 300.—III. Others observing it, with the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the moon, whatever day of the week that happened upon, 302.—IV. They who kept it on the Lord's-day did not always agree to fix it on the same Lord's-day, by reason of their different calculations, 309.—V. But they all agreed to pay a great respect and honour to it, as to the day of our Lord's resurrection, 317.—VI. On this

day the emperors granted a general release to the prisons, and pardoned all criminals, except some few that were guilty of crimes of a more unpardonable nature, 318.—VII. At this time also it was usual more than ordinarily for men to show their charity to slaves by granting them their freedom, 323.—VIII. And to the poor by liberal donations, 323.—IX. The whole week after Easter-day celebrated with sermons, communions, &c., as part of the same festival, 324.—X. All public games prohibited during this whole season, 325.—XI. And all proceedings at law, except in some special and extraordinary cases, 326.—XII. The Sunday after Easter, commonly called *Dominica Nova*, and *Dominica in Albis*, observed with great solemnity, as the conclusion of the Paschal festival, 327.

CHAPTER VI.

Of Pentecost, or Whitsuntide.

SECT. I. Pentecost taken in a double sense among the Ancients. First, for the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide; and secondly, for the single day of Pentecost, 328.—II. During which time the Church chiefly exercised herself in reading and meditating upon the Acts of the Apostles, as the great confirmation of our Lord's resurrection, 329.—III. All fasting and kneeling at prayers prohibited at this season, as on the Lord's-day, 331.—IV. And all public games and stage-plays; but not pleading at law forbidden, or bodily labour, 332.—V. Of Ascension-day, its antiquity and observation, 333.—VI. Of Pentecost in the stricter sense, as denoting the festival of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, 337.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the Festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs.

SECT. I. The original of the festivals of martyrs, 339.—II. Why called their *natalitia*, or *birthdays*, 340.—III. These festivals usually kept at the graves of the martyrs, 342.—IV. And mostly confined to those particular churches where the martyrs suffered and lay buried, 343.—V. Usual to read the Acts or Passions of the Martyrs on their proper festivals, 344.—VI. And to make panegyrical orations upon them, 346.—VII. The communion always administered upon these days, 350.—VIII. And herein a particular commemoration of the martyrs was made, called the oblation, or sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God for them, and prayer for a general consummation and happy resurrection, 351.—IX. The night preceding any of these festivals commonly observed as a vigil, with psalmody and prayers, 353.—X. Common entertainments made by the rich for the use of the poor upon these festivals at the graves of the martyrs, till abuses caused them to be laid aside, 353.—XI. What festivals observed in memory of the Apostles, 359.—XII. The festival of the Holy Innocents, 361.—XIII. The festival of the Maccabees, 363.—XIV. Of the general festival of all the martyrs, 364.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of some other festivals of a later date and lesser observation.

SECT. I. Of the *encæniæ*, or *feasts of dedications of churches*, 368.—II. Of the anniversary festivals of bishops' ordinations, 369.—III. Of festivals kept in memory of any great deliverances or signal mercies vouchsafed by God to his Church, 373.—IV. Of the feast of the Annunciation, 375.—V. Of the festival called *Hypapante*, afterward *Purification* and *Candlemas-day*, 376.—VI. The original of festivals in honour of confessors and other holy men, 379.

BOOK XXI.

OF THE FASTS IN USE IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Quadragesimal or Lent fast.

SECT. I. What this fast was originally, forty days or forty hours, 381.—II. Some probability that at first it was only a fast of forty hours, or the two days from the passion to the resurrection, 383.—III. Great variety in point of time observable in the celebration of this fast in many Churches, 386.—IV. Lent consisted not of above thirty-six fasting days in any Church till the time of Gregory the Great, because all Sundays were universally excepted out of the fast, and all Saturdays except one in all the Eastern Churches, 388.—V. Who first added Ash Wednesday and the other three days in the Roman Church to the beginning of Lent, 389.—VI. Whether the Ancients reputed Lent to be an apostolical institution, 390.—VII. In what sense some of them say it is a divine institution, 392.—VIII. How far allowed to be a tradition or canon apostolical, 394.—IX. What were the causes or reasons of instituting the Lent fast. First, the Apostles' sorrow for the loss of their Master, 396.—X. Secondly, the declension of Christian piety from its first and primitive fervour, 397.—XI. Thirdly, that men might prepare themselves for a worthy participation of the communion at Easter, 398.—XII. Fourthly, that catechumens might prepare themselves for baptism, 399.—XIII. And penitents for absolution at Easter, 401.—XIV. Lent generally observed by all Christians, though with a great liberty and just allowance to men's infirmities, being in a great measure left to their own discretion, 403.—XV. How the Montanists differed from the Church about the imposition of fasts, 409.—XVI. The Lent fast kept with a perfect abstinence from all food every day till evening, 411.—XVII. Change of diet not accounted a proper fast for Lent, without perfect abstinence till evening, 412.—XVIII. What they spared in a dinner not spent in evening luxury, but bestowed on the poor, 415.—XIX. All corporal punishments forbidden by the imperial laws in Lent, 416.—XX. Religious assemblies and sermons every day in Lent, 418.—XXI. And frequent communions, especially on the

Sabbath and the Lord's-day, 419.—XXII. All public games and stage-plays prohibited at this season, 420.—XXIII. As also the celebration of all festivals, birthdays, and marriages, as unsuitable to the present occasion, 422.—XXIV. The Great Week before Easter observed with greater strictness and solemnity, 422.—XXV. What meant by the fasts, called *ὑπερθέσεις* and *superpositiones, superpository* and *additional fasts* in this week, 425.—XXV.* Of their several sorts of abstinence, 427.—XXVI. Christians more liberal in their alms and charity this week above others, 429.—XXVII. This week a week of rest and liberty for servants, 429.—XXVIII. A general release granted at this time by the emperors to all prisoners, both debtors and criminals, some particular cases of criminals only excepted, 429.—XXIX. All processes at law, as well civil as criminal, suspended this whole week before Easter, 430.—XXX. The Thursday in this week how observed, 430.—XXXI. Of the Passion-day, or the Pasch of our Lord's crucifixion, 433.—XXXII. Of the Saturday or Great Sabbath before Easter, 434.

CHAPTER II.

Of the fasts of the Four Seasons; of monthly fasts, and the original of Ember weeks and Rogation days.

SECT. I. The fast of March, or the first month, the same with the Lent fast, 439.—II. The fast of Pentecost, 440.—III. The fast of the seventh month, or the Autumnal fast, 442.—IV. The Advent or Nativity fast, called *the fast of December*, or *the tenth month*, 442.—V. The fast at Epiphany, 443.—VI. Of monthly fasts, 443.—VII. The original of the four Ember weeks, or ordination-fasts, 444.—VIII. The original of the rogation-fast, 445.

CHAPTER III.

Of the weekly fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, or the stationary days of the Ancient Church.

SECT. I. The original of these fasts, 448.—II. The reasons of their institution, 450.—III. How they differed from the Lent fast, and all others in point of duration, 451.—IV. With what solemnity they were observed, 453.—V. How the Catholics and Montanists disputed about the observation of them, 454.—VI. How the Wednesday-fast came to be changed to Saturday in the Western Churches, 456.

THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK XVII.

OF THE EXERCISE OF DISCIPLINE AMONG THE CLERGY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the difference between ecclesiastical censures inflicted on clergymen and laymen.

The peculiar notion of *communio ecclesiastica*, and *excommunicatio ecclesiastica*, as applied to the clergy.

1. We have hitherto taken a general view of the discipline of the Church, as it respected all the members of the community falling into the several crimes deserving excommunication. But to have a complete notion and full comprehension of the Church's discipline we are to consider there were some punishments peculiar to the clergy, and some censures so particularly respecting their office and function, that they could only be inflicted on them, and not upon laymen. In regard to which, clerical communion and lay-communion were always considered as distinct things; and a man might be deprived of the former, whilst he was allowed to enjoy the benefit and privilege of the latter; and even that, which was many times a very great punishment in a clergyman or ecclesiastical person, was no punishment at all in a secular person or layman. For there was no suspension from office or benefit, no degradation or deposition, no reduction to lay-communion, that could affect a layman, as they were punishments: but all these were great punishments as inflicted on the clergy, because they deprived

them of those special honours and advantageous privileges that were peculiar to their function. In reference to which things we sometimes find the terms *communio ecclesiastica*, and *excommunicatio ecclesiastica*, *ecclesiastical communion*, and *ecclesiastical excommunication*, used in a peculiar and restrained sense, not for communion or excommunication in general, but for admission to, or expulsion from, these particular honours and advantages, which were peculiarly appropriated to ecclesiastical persons, or such as were of the clerical order and function. Therefore, though some canons[1] take *suspension from ecclesiastical communion* for *suspension of laymen from the communion of the eucharist or the prayers of the Church;* yet other canons, speaking of the clergy and their punishment, take *ecclesiastical communion* in a more restrained sense, for *communicating in the offices of the clerical function.* So that a clergyman was said to be *excommunicated* when he was deprived of the power of exercising the offices of his function; and such an excommunication does not always imply that he was wholly cast out of all communion with the Church, but only communion as specified with this limitation and restriction. This distinction is noted by Balsamon[2], and Zonaras[3], and many other learned men[4] after them: and it is necessary to

[1] Vid. C. Agathens. c. 37. (t. 4. p. 1389 c.) Itaque censuimus homicidas et falsos testes a communione ecclesiastica submovendos, nisi pœnitentiæ satisfactione crimina admissa diluerint.—C. Aurelian. 4. c. 19. (t. 5. p. 384 d.) Quicunque pro devotione sua oblationis studio aliquid in campellis vel in vineolis, etiam absque scriptura, probatur ecclesiæ contulisse; si postmodum vel ipse, vel hæredes ejus, quacunque occasione auferre a jure hoc ecclesiæ vel alienare voluerint, quoad usque a tali intentione discedant, aut perversa restituant, a communione ecclesiastica suspendantur.—Conf. C. Aurelian. 5. c. 16. (ibid. p. 395 a.) Quisquis etiam aut majorum aut mediocrium personarum, &c.

[2] In c. 16. C. Nicæn. (ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 1. p. 77 a.) *Δέδοκται.. τοὺς μετακαλουμένους κληρικοὺς παρὰ τῶν χειροτονησάντων αὐτοὺς, καὶ μὴ πειθομένους ἀναστρέφειν, ἀκοινωνήτους αὐτοῦς εἶναι, ἤγουν, μὴ παραχωρεῖσθαι συνιερουργεῖν τούτοις· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ μὴ κοινωνεῖν ἐκλαμβάνεται, οὐ μὴν εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκκλησιάζειν, ἢ εἰς τὸ μὴ μεταλαμβάνειν τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, κ. τ. λ.*

[3] In eund. can. (ap. Bevereg. ibid. c.) *Οἶμαι τοίνυν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος κανόνος τὸ ἀκοινωνήτους εἶναι, οὕτως νοεῖσθαι, ἤγουν, μὴ συγκοινωνεῖν αὐτοῖς τοὺς ἱερατικοὺς δηλαδή· ἀλλὰ ἀποτρέπεσθαι τὸ συνιερουργεῖν αὐτοῖς τοὺς τοιούτους· κοινωνίαν ἐνταῦθα τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων οὐχὶ τὴν μετάληψιν τῶν ἁγιασμάτων ὀνομασάντων, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν συμμεταχείρησιν καὶ κοινοπραξίαν, καὶ τὸ συλλειτουργεῖν τοῖς, οἵσπερ προσῆλθον.*

[4] Albaspin. Observ. l. 1 c. 2. (ad calc. Optat. p. 10 e.) De ecclesiastica [communione] hoc nunc habeo, quod tot genera et species hujusce communionis censerentur, quot sunt ordinum gradus, et quot modis ab his gradibus excidere poterant clerici: qui enim in episcopum [leg.

be observed, for the right understanding of many ancient canons[5], where the words ἀκοινώνητος, ἀφορισμὸς, ἐκκηρύττεσθαι, which signify *excommunication*, can have no other meaning, as applied to the clergy, but only to denote their degradation or suspension.

The clergy usually punished by a removal from their office, but not always sub-

2. This may be confirmed from an observation that has been made once before in a former Book[6], that some ancient canons expressly forbid the clergy to be punished by the ordinary way of excommunication, which implies a total removal from the communion of the Church; but thought it sufficient to

episcopatum] allectus esset, longe alia ratione hujusce communitatis erat particeps, quam qui sola diaconatus aut presbyteriatus dignitate pollebat. Rursus cum nonnunquam evenire posset, ut gradus sui honore is non privaretur, cui tamen ob aliquod crimen ejusdem gradus munia obire non liceret, exempli causa, sedis et consessus honor cuipiam episcopo relinqui poterat, cui verbi divini administratio, pœnitentiæ concessio, et cæteræ ejusmodi episcopatus partes interdictæ et prohibitæ essent; huic ergo, quamvis episcopo, non eadem erat pars, nec æqua omnino in eadem communione cum cæteris episcopis, quod videlicet de ea non nihil amisisset, et jus illud imminutum esset.... Præterea notandum est, quotiescunque in canonibus a communione clerici secluduntur, quamvis nihil aliud adjectum sit, quo genus communionis significetur, id de ecclesiastica communione esse accipiendum: quæ ab iisdem ecclesiastica, nonnunquam etiam sacerdotalis vocatur.—Habert. Archierat., ad Censur. Pontif. observ. 5. (p. 745.) Non est contemnendum, quod monet aptissime Morinus, suspensionem significari aliquando nomine τοῦ ἀφορισμοῦ, *separationis*, quoties intentatur clericis ante depositionem, quasi eis eucharistica quidem communio relinquatur; sola vero ecclesiastica, quæ ad ordinis et ministerii exsecutionem spectat, ad tempus interdicatur: ut Apostol. Can. 45.—Suicer. Thes. Eccles. voce, Ἀφορισμός. (t. 1. p. 600 a. ad calc.) Est *levior excommunicatio clericorum*, quæ est privatio communionis ecclesiasticæ, seu segregatio et suspensio eorum ab officio. Atque de hac segregatione intelligendus est Canon 43. Apostol. (CC. [c. 42.] t. 1. p. 36 b.) Ὑποδιάκονος, ἢ ἀναγνώστης, ἢ ψάλτης, τὰ ὅμοια ποιῶν, ἢ παυσάσθω, ἢ ἀφοριζέσθω· ὡσαύτως καὶ λαϊκοί. *Hypodiaconus, aut lector, aut cantor, similia faciens;* (nempe iis, quæ canone proxime præcedente episcopi, presbyteri, et diaconi facere vetantur, κύβοις σχολάζειν καὶ μέθαις, *aleæ vacare aut ebrietati;*) *vel desinat, vel segregetur*.... C. 66. (CC. [c. 55.] ibid. p. 37 d.) Εἴ τις κληρικὸς ὑβρίζει πρεσβύτερον ἢ διάκονον, ἀφοριζέσθω. ... C. 57. (CC. [c. 56.] ibid.) Εἴ τις κληρικὸς χωλὸν, ἢ κωφὸν, ἢ τυφλὸν, ἢ τὰς βάσεις πεπληγμένον χλευάσει, ἀφοριζέσθω· ὡσαύτως καὶ λαϊκός.... Vide etiam cc. 6, 45, 58, 59, 62. (ap. CC. [cc. 5, 44, 57, 58, 71.] ibid. pp. 25 d. 36 b. 37 d, e. 41 b.) In his canonibus τὸ τοῦ ἀφορισμοῦ ἐπιτίμιον, ut loquitur Theophylactus in 1. ad Tim. 1. ad v. 20. p. 753. notat privationem communionis ecclesiasticæ, seu segregationem clericorum et suspensionem ab officio: ita enim ἀφορισθέντες non possunt μηδὲ ὅλως ἱερατικόν τι ἐνεργεῖν, *ullum officium sacerdotale obire*, ut de hac ἀφορισμοῦ specie scribit Balsamon ad can. 79. Concilii Carthaginensis, p. 704.

[5] Vid. Cc. Apost. 6, 43, 45, 54, 57, 58, 59, 72. See them, as cited by Suicer, in the preceding note.

[6] B. 6. ch. 2. s. 2. v. 2. pp. 200, 201.

jected to public penance, as men wholly cast out of the communion of the Church.

punish them by a removal from their office; and that because it was not proper to punish men doubly for the same offence. 'If a bishop, presbyter, or deacon,' says one of the Apostolical Canons[7], 'be taken in fornication, perjury, or theft, he shall be deposed, but not excommunicated: for the Scripture says, *Thou shalt not punish twice for the same crime.*' And the like rule is prescribed in the Canons of Peter[8], bishop of Alexandria, and those of St. Basil[9].

Yet in some special cases both penalties inflicted.

3. Yet for some more flagrant crimes both penalties were inflicted, as appears from the same Apostolical Canons[10], which order, 'that if any clergyman was found guilty of simony, or any such heinous offence, he should not only be deposed from his office, but be cast out of the Church.' And a great many learned men[11] are of opinion, that this was the constant practice of the Church even in the three first ages, when the Apostolical Canons were most in force. It is certain it was so in the time of Cyprian: for he, speaking of Novatus[12], who was guilty of murder in causing his own wife by a blow to mis-

[7] C. 25. [al. 24.] (Cotel. [c. 18.] v. 1. p. 440.) Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ὁ [al. ἐπὶ] πορνείᾳ, ἢ ἐπιορκίᾳ, ἢ κλοπῇ ἁλούς, καθαιρείσθω, καὶ μὴ ἀφοριζέσθω· λέγει γὰρ ἡ Γραφή, Οὐκ ἐκδικήσεις δὶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

[8] C. 10. See before, b. 6. ch. 2. s. 2. v. 2. p. 201. n. 47.

[9] Cc. 3, 32, 51. See ibid. n. 46.

[10] Cc. Apost. 29, 30, 51. See ibid. nn. 48, 49.

[11] Pagi, Crit. in Baron. an. 67. n. 15. [al. 19.] (t. 1. p. 57.) Sic intelligendus etiam Leo in Epistola 2. ad Rusticum Narbonensem episcopum in Inquisitione secunda, ubi ait: *Alienum est a consuetudine ecclesiastica, ut qui presbyterali honore aut in diaconi gradu fuerint consecrati, ii pro crimine aliquo suo per manus impositionem remedium accipiant pœnitendi; quod sine dubio ex apostolica traditione descendit.* Quibus ex verbis eruitur, inquit Quesnellus, minoris ordinis clericos, inter quos subdiaconi numerabantur, non semper agendæ pœnitentiæ lege exemptos fuisse. Sed quod hanc disciplinam a consuetudine ecclesiastica, immo ex apostolica traditione arcessit Leo, illud benigne intelligendum: nec enim de hac traditione uspiam apparet, cum potius tribus fere primis sæculis clericos etiam majores pœnitentiæ publicæ fuisse subjectos multis probet Morinus in Commentario de Pœnitentia.—Quesnel. Not. in Leo. Ep. ad Rustic. Narbonnens. (ap. Pagi, ibid.) See the foregoing passage.—Morin. de Pœnitent. l. 4. c. 12. tot. (pp. 191, seqq.) Eodem tempore, &c.—Fell. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 4. ad Pompon. p. 4. (p. 174. n. 7.) Pro recepto diu in ecclesia more, in laicorum crimina excommunicatione reliquisque ecclesiæ censuris, at clericorum depositione animadverti solitum. Sed tribus primis sæculis, episcopos, presbyteros, et diaconos pœnitentiæ publicæ et manuum imponi [leg. impositioni], sicut laicos, obnoxios fuisse, res est manifesta.

[12] Ep. 49. [al. 52.] ad Cornel. p. 97. (pp. 238, 239.) .... Propter hoc se non de presbyterio tantum, sed et communicatione prohibere pro certo tenebat, &c.

carry, says, 'that for this crime he was not only to be degraded, or expelled the presbytery, but to be deprived of the communion of the Church also.' And in the following ages there are innumerable examples of this practice, as the learned reader may satisfy himself by consulting the passages referred [13] to in the margin.

Of suspension from their revenues.

4. Now that, which we are concerned at present to inquire after, are those punishments which particularly affected the clergy: and these were of three sorts; such as respected their maintenance, such as respected their office, and such as respected their persons in corporal chastisement and correction.

Sometimes they were punished in their maintenance by withdrawing the usual portion of the Church's revenues, which was allotted to them out of the public stock for their maintenance and subsistence. The revenues of the Church, as has been observed in a former Book [14], were usually divided among the clergy once a month, whence it had the name of *divisio men-*

[13] C. Neocæsar. c. 1. (t. 1. p. 1480 e.) Πρεσβύτερος ἐὰν γήμῃ, τῆς τάξεως αὐτὸν μετατίθεσθαι· ἐὰν δὲ πορνεύσῃ, ἢ μοιχεύσῃ, ἐξωθεῖσθαι αὐτὸν τέλεον, καὶ ἄγεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς μετάνοιαν. *If a presbyter marries, he shall be removed from his order: but if he commits fornication or adultery, he shall be wholly expelled the Church, and reduced to the discipline of repentance.*—Vid. C. Agathens. c. 8. (t. 4. p. 1384 d.) Id etiam placuit, ut clericus, si, relicto officio suo propter districtionem, ad sæculorum judicem fortasse confugerit, et [is ad quem recurrit] solatium ei defensionis impenderit, cum eodem de ecclesiæ communione pellatur.—Conf. c. 42. (ibid. p. 1390 d.) ..... Hoc quicunque clericus vel laicus detectus fuerit vel consulere vel docere, ab ecclesia habeatur extraneus.—C. Ilerdens. c. 1. (ibid. p. 1611 a.) De his clericis, &c.—C. 5. (ibid. p. 1612 b.) ... Si iterato, &c.—C. Valent. Hispan. c. 3. (ibid. p. 1619 a.) .... Si quis autem immemor, &c.—C. Venet. c. 16. (ibid. p. 1057 b.) Ac ne id fortasse, &c.—C. Aurelian. c. 11. (ibid. p. 1406 e.) De his, qui &c.—C. Aurelian. 3. c. 4. (t. 5. p. 297 d.) De familiaritate, &c.—Ibid. c. 7. (p. 297 d.) Clerici vero, &c.—Ibid. c. 8. (e.) Si quis clericus, &c.—C. Turon. 1. c. 3. (t. 4. p. 1051 c.) Et quia nullum Diabolo, &c.—Ibid. c. 5. (d.) Si quis vero clericus, &c.—C. Tolet. 2. c. 3. (ibid. p. 1734 b.) .... Sane si post datam hanc monitionem, &c.—C. Tolet. 11. c. 5. (t. 6. p. 549 b.) ... Si quis episcoporum, &c.—Ibid. c. 6. (e.) ... Quod si quisquam, &c.—Vigil. Decret. c. 6. (CC. t. 5. p. 313 e.) Si quis episcopus, &c.—Felix. 3., Ep. 6. ad Acacium, (CC. t. 4. p. 1704 e.) writes thus to him: Sacerdotali honore, et communione catholica, nec non etiam a fidelium numero segregatus, sublatum tibi nomen et munus ministerii sacerdotalis agnosce.—Vid. C. Asiatic. Ep. ad Ioan. Constantinopol. in Synodo sub Menna. Act. 1. ap. Crabb. t. 2. p. 36. (Labb. [act. 5.] t. 5. p. 161, seqq.) et C. Constantinop. sub Flaviano, in Act. 1.—C. Chalced. ap. Crabb. p. 780. (Labb. t. 4. p. 229 d.) Ὅθεν ἐπιδακρύσαντες, κ. τ. λ., where Eutyches is punished both with deposition and excommunication, as all heretics commonly were.

[14] B. 5. ch. 4. s. 1. v. 2. p. 157.

surna, the monthly division: and when there was occasion to punish a delinquent clergyman for some less offence, it was done by withdrawing this usual portion of the monthly division from him. As appears from that of Cyprian [15], who, speaking of some of the inferior clergy that had offended, says, 'they should be withheld or suspended from their monthly division, but not be deprived of their ministerial office in the Church.'

Of suspension from their office.

5. Sometimes they were suspended, not only from their revenues, but from their office and function. And this was either temporary and limited, or perpetual and without restriction. The temporary suspension was only a depriving them of the execution of their office for a certain term; and, when that term was over, they had liberty to resume their place and return to the execution of their office in all the parts and duties of their function: but the perpetual suspension was a total deprivation of them from all power and dignity belonging to the clerical office, and a reduction of them to the state and condition of laymen, without any ordinary hopes or prospect of ever recovering their ancient station.

The former of these is commonly called by the Ancients *abstention* and *suspension from communion*, meaning clerical communion only; and the latter vulgarly known by the name of *degradation, de-ordination,* or *deposition from the office and order of the clerical function.* Thus Cyprian writing to Rogatian [16], an African bishop, concerning a contumacious deacon who rebelled against him, bids him 'to depose him from his office, or at least suspend him.' The penalty of suspension was for less crimes, as in the instance given in the Council of Epone [17]: 'If a bishop, presbyter, or deacon be detected to keep dogs for hunting, or hawks for fowling, the bishop is to

[15] Ep. 28. [al. 34.] ad Cler. (p. 218.) Interim se a divisione mensurna tantum contineant, non quasi a ministerio ecclesiastico privati esse videantur.—Conf. C. Carth. 4. c. 49. (t. 2. p. 1204 b.) Clericus, qui &c.—Justin. Novel. 123. c. 42. (t. 5. p. 561.) Si monachus, &c.

[16] Ep. 3. p. 6. (p. 173.) .... Fungeris circa eum potestate honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas vel abstineas.

[17] C. 3. (t. 4. p. 1576 e.) Episcopis, presbyteris, atque diaconibus canes ad venandum, et accipitres [ad aucupandum] habere non liceat. Quod si quis talium personarum in hac fuerit voluntate detectus, si episcopus est, tribus mensibus se a communione suspendat; duobus presbyter abstineat [al. abstineatur]; uno diaconus ab omni officio et communione cessabit.

be suspended for three months, the presbyter for two, and the deacon for one.' So by a canon of the Council of Lerida[18]: 'If any clergyman in a siege bore arms and killed a man, though it were one of the enemies, he was to be suspended from his office two years, and be rendered incapable of any further promotion; because the canons in all cases whatsoever peremptorily forbad a clergyman to be concerned in blood.

Of deposition or degradation.

6. The other sort of suspension, commonly called *καθαίρεσις*, *deposition* or *degradation*, was a total and perpetual suspension of the power and authority committed to a clergyman in his ordination. For as the Church had power to grant this authority and commission at first, so she had power to resume and withdraw it again upon great misdemeanors and just provocation. And then a clergyman, whatever character he sustained before, was totally divested both of the name and dignity, and power and authority, belonging to his former order and function. By some canons therefore he is said 'to be degraded, deprived, and turned out of office[19];' by others 'to be totally deposed[20];' 'totally to fall from his order or degree[21];'

[18] C. 1. (ibid. p. 1611 a.) De his clericis, qui in obsessionis necessitate positi fuerint, id statutum est, ut.... ab omni humano sanguine, etiam hostili, [se] abstineant. Quod si in hoc inciderint, duobus annis tam officio quam communione [corporis Domini] priventur.... Et ita demum officio vel communione reddantur, ea tamen ratione [servata], ne ulterius ad officia potiora provehantur [al. promoveantur]. — See other instances of suspension in Basil's Canons, c. 69. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 217. Canonic. Prim.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1752 b.) Ἀναγνώστης ἐὰν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μνηστῇ πρὸ τοῦ γάμου συναλλάξειεν, ἐνιαυτὸν ἀργήσας, εἰς τὸ ἀναγινώσκειν δεχθήσεται, μένων ἀπρόκοπος· κλεψιγαμήσας δὲ ἄνευ μνηστείας, παυθήσεται τῆς ὑπηρεσίας· τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ὑπηρέτης.—C. Bracar. 3. cc. 1, 5. (t. 5. p. 896 c. p. 897 d.)—C. Aurelian. 3. cc. 2, 16, 25. (ibid. p. 296 a. p. 300 a. p. 302 a.)—C. Aurelian. 5. cc. 5, 18. (ibid. p. 392 c. p. 395 e.)

[19] C. Carth. 4. c. 48. (t. 2. p. 1240 b.) Clericus, qui non pro emendo aliquid in nundinis vel in foro deambulat, ab officio suo degradetur.—C. 49. (ibid. b.) Clericus, qui absque corpusculi sui inæqualitate vigiliis deest, stipendiis privetur.—C. 1. (ibid. b.) Clericum inter tentationes ab officio suo declinantem, vel negligentius agentem, ab officio suo removendum. — C. Tarracon. c. 10. (t. 4. p. 1565 c.) Si qui ista [munera] probantur accipere, veluti exactores fœnoris, aut usurarum possessores, secundum statuta patrum se noverit degradandos.

[20] C. Antioch. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 564 c.) Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καταφρονήσας τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἰδίου, ἀφώρισεν ἑαυτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας..... τοῦτον καθαιρεῖσθαι παντελῶς, καὶ μηκέτι θεραπείας τυγχάνειν, μηδὲ δύνασθαι λαμβάνειν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τιμήν.

[21] C. Ephes. c. 6. (t. 3. p. 806 d.) .... Εἴ τινες βουληθεῖεν τὰ περὶ ἑκάστων πεπραγμένα ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ

'to be de-ordained or un-ordained[22];' 'to be removed out of the order of the clergy[23];' 'to cease to be of the number of the clergy[24];' and 'to be reduced to lay-communion,' that is, to the state and quality and condition of laymen.

All these expressions, except the last, are commonly well understood by modern writers: but some, to serve a peculiar hypothesis, have invented very odd and strange notions of it. Therefore, to set the matter in a right light, and give a just account of the discipline of the Church, it will not be amiss to be a little more particular upon this point, and show distinctly what the Ancients meant by this part of their discipline, which they call *reducing a clergyman to the state and communion of laymen*, which I shall make the subject of the following chapter.

CHAP. II.

Of reducing the clergy to the state and communion of laymen as a punishment for great offences.

Lay-communion not the same as communion in one kind only.

1. LAY-COMMUNION in a layman was no punishment, but a privilege, and one of the greatest privileges that belonged to him as a Christian: for it was entitling him to all the benefits and advantages of Christian communion. But in a clergyman it was one of the greatest of punishments, reducing him from the highest dignity and station in the Church to the level and standard of every ordinary Christian. But now the question is, Wherein the nature of this punishment consisted?

Bellarmin[25] and some other writers of the Romish Church, taking the word in a new and modern sense, expound it of communion in one kind, and bring it as an argument to prove that the primitive Church denied the people the use of the cup

τῇ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ οἱῳδήποτε τρόπῳ παρασαλεύειν, ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ὥρισεν, εἰ μὲν ἐπίσκοποι εἶεν, ἢ κληρικοὶ, τοῦ οἰκείου παντελῶς ἀποπίπτειν βαθμοῦ· εἰ δὲ λαϊκοὶ, ἀκοινωνήτους ὑπάρχειν.

22 Acta Servatii Tungrensis, ap. Crabb. (t. 1. p. 318.) Nulla mora... Euphratas deordinatur, &c.—[Vid. C. Agrippens. in quo Euphratas, Coloniæ Agrippinæ episcopus, quod Christum Deum negaret, hæresis damnatus atque exauctoratus est, anno Christi 346. (Labb. CC. t. 2. pp. 615 b, seqq.) et conf. ibid. (p. 617 b.) Savatius episcopus dixit, &c. ED.]

23 C. Arelatens. c. 13. (t. 1. p. 1428 d.) Ab ordine cleri amoveatur.

24 C. Nicæn. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 29 c.) Πεπαύσθω τοῦ κλήρου.

25 De Eucharist. l. 4. c. 24. p. 678. (t. 3. p. 749 b.) See before, b. 15. ch. 5. s. 1. v. 5. p. 407. n. 45. Quintus ritus erat, &c.

in the Lord's supper, and administered the communion to them only in one kind, because the word *lay-communion* bears that signification in the present Church of Rome. But this is only begging a principle, and supposing a practice, of which there is not the least footstep to be met with in the ancient Church, as I have fully demonstrated in a former Book[26]. And it is such a piece of ignorance and misrepresentation of the ancient discipline, as other learned men in the Romish Church are commonly ashamed of. The notion is entirely rejected and confuted by Lindanus[27], Albaspinæus[28], Peter de Marca[29], Rigaltius[30], Durantus[31], and Cardinal Bona[32], who tacitly re-

[26] B. 15. ch. 5. v. 5. p. 405.

[27] Panoplia, l. 4. c. 58. (p. 499.) Laicam igitur comunionem sunt qui existimant fuisse sanctæ eucharistiæ sub una panis specie communionem. Quod quam sit a veritate alienum, mecum agnoscet spero, qui priscæ consuetudinis sedulus investigator considerarit, laicam communionem tunc vel in primis in usu fuisse, cum passim prisco de more utraque communionis species et panis et calicis toti exhibebatur ecclesiæ.

[28] Observat. l. 1. c. 4. (ad calc. Optat. p. 13 e.) Omnis de laica communione quæstio, &c.

[29] Tractat. in Cap. *Clericus*, ad calc. Baluzii de Emendat. Gratiani. p. 585. (ap. Oper. De Marc. Bamberg. 1789. t. 4. p. 418. s. 16.) Quæ laica communio significat, clericum non solum e consessu cleri extra cancellos depulsum, et redactum in locum et ordinem laicorum ad communicandum synaxi, sed deturbatum omnino a corpore cleri, et ad laicam conditionem detrusum; ita ut seposito privilegio, quod antea illi competebat, nunc pertineat ad forum sæculare in causa civili et criminali: in quo distinguitur hæc communio laica a peregrina; cum ista retineat clericum in ordine cleri, etsi gradu consessus et sportulis ordinariis mulctatum, præter alimenta; laica vero eum ab illo ordine depellat.

[30] In Cypr. Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. (Prior. p. 69 n. g. Fell. p. 244. n. 9.) Sæviente adversus Christianos persecutione, si quem forte in ordine constitutum ecclesiastico, puta episcopum, presbyterum, diaconum, exsilii metus aut violentia tormentorum de fide Christo data dejecerat, is ad fidem reversus, postquam impetrata peractaque pœnitentia satis fecerat ecclesiæ, recipiebat quidem ecclesiasticam communionem, hoc est, societatem et conversationem cum cæteris fidelibus, ita ut fieret particeps corporis Christi; sed non recipiebat locum, quem in ordine prius tenuerat. Itaque de episcopo, de presbytero, de diacono fiebat id, quod erat, priusquam fuisset ordinatus. Reddebatur illi locus in ecclesia, non dignitas loci. Communicabat ut laicus sive plebeius: utebatur jure cæterorum fidelium, qui nondum erant promoti ad quenquam ordinem ecclesiasticum. Hæc erat tunc temporis *communio laica:* cujus adeo participes eucharistica sacramenta, speciem inquam utramque panis et vini, sumebant. Hodie *communionem laicam* diceremus, quæ sub una tantum specie panis conceditur, etiam episcopis et sacerdotibus extra sacrificiorum officia communicantibus. Immo et *communionis* vocabulum vix audimus alio significatu quam eucharistiæ celebrandæ.

[31] De Ritibus, &c. l. 2. c. 55. nn. 6, 7. (p. 282.) Verius est, *laicam communionem* dictam, quæ extra sacratiorem locum sacrificii fit, ubi tum sacerdos conficiens, tum ministri communicabant. Solis enim sacratis licebat ad altare accedere et communicare. Synod. Laodic. c.

flects upon Bellarmin and his followers for their childish explication of this ancient term to make it comply with the modern practice. 'They no sooner hear,' says he, 'of the name *lay-communion*, but overlooking the ancient notion, they presently take it only in the sense which it now bears, and interpret it *communion in one kind;* the falseness of which we may learn from hence, that we often read of clergymen being thrust down to lay-communion at that time when laymen communicated in both kinds.'

Neither does it signify *communicating among laymen without the rails of the chancel.*

2. Lindanus had long before used the very same argument, and advanced a more probable explication, that lay-communion might denote a clergyman's being thrust down to communicate among laymen without the rails of the chancel: which has so much of plausibility in it, that the learned Dr. Forbes[33] and Vossius[34] give in to this opinion. But though this has something of truth in it, yet it does not express the full meaning of lay-communion. For a man might be admitted to lay-communion not only in the church, but in a private house, or upon his death-bed, where there could be no such distinction.

But a total degradation or deprivation of orders, and reduction to the state

3. Therefore the full import of the phrase, and the adequate notion of reducing a clergyman to lay-communion, is totally degrading and depriving him of his orders, that is, the power and authority of his clerical office and function, and reducing him to the state and quality and simple condition of a layman.

19. Καὶ μόνοις ἐξὸν εἶναι τοῖς ἱερατικοῖς εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ κοινωνεῖν. Id. in Synod. Sext. in Trull. c. 68. *Ea vero loci, quoad communionem, distinctio adeo tum pertinebat ad ordinis ecclesiastici dignitatem et venerationem, ut gravioris supplicii loco sacerdotes cæterique clerici extra sacros cancellos, cum laicis et veluti laici, communicarent.*

32 Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 19. n. 3. (p. 327.) Recentiores, qui audito nomine communionis, ejus veteri notione neglecta, id solum concipiunt, quod hodie ea voce significaretur, *laicam communionem* nihil aliud esse putant, quam perceptionem eucharistiæ sub unica specie, aut extra cancellos, more laicorum; quod quam falsum sit, vel ex eo liquet, quod sæpe clericos ad laicam communionem detrusos legimus eo tempore, quo etiam laici sub utraque specie communicabant.

33 Irenicum, l. 2. c. 11. prop. 13. p. 221. (t. 1. p. 437.) Laica illa communio non fuit communio sub una tantum specie, sicut pueriliter nugatur Bellarminus, lib. 4. de Eucharist. c. 24. *Sed neque hæc, &c.:* sed fuit sub utraque specie communio extra cancellos sanctuarii, seu loci illius, qui erat episcopo et presbyteris et diaconis tributus, eratque laicis celebrationis tempore inaccessus.

34 Thes. Theol. disp. 33. thes. 5. p. 514. (t. 6. p. 447.).... Communio laica dicebatur, quando clerici, ob delictum aliquod, non cum clero, sed inter laicos extra cancellos, communicabant.

and condition of laymen.

Thus Chamier[35] rightly explains it against Bellarmin, when he observes, 'that it was called *lay-communion* neither from the place of communicating, nor from communicating in one species, nor from the time and order of communicating the laity after the clergy, but from the condition and quality of the person communicating; namely, because he, that before was a clergyman, or in the roll and nomenclature of the clergy, is now become a layman, and reckoned as one in the order of laymen only.' This supposes a power in the Church, not only of conferring clerical orders at first to men, and promoting them from laymen to be bishops or presbyters or deacons; but also a power of recalling these offices, and divesting them of all power and authority belonging to them, by degrading clergymen upon just reasons, and reducing them to the state and quality of laymen again. This is undoubtedly the true meaning of all those ancient canons and writers which speak so often of degrading clergymen for their offences, and allowing them only to communicate in the quality of laymen. Hereby they were deprived of their order and office, and power and authority, and even the name and title of clergymen; and reputed and treated as private Christians, wholly divested of all their former dignity and clerical powers and privileges, and reduced entirely to the state and condition of laymen. Of which, because I have had occasion to discourse at large in another Work[36], I shall not need to say much in this place, but only add a few testimonies that were then omitted.

In the third Council of Orleans there is a canon[37] which orders, 'that if a clergyman, either by his own confession or conviction, was proved guilty of adultery, he should be deposed from his office, and be confined to lay-communion in a monastery all his days.' And another canon[38] appoints, 'that if any

[35] De Eucharist. l. 9. c. 3. s. 37. (t. 4. p. 487 e.) Appellatam autem fuisse laicam [communionem] non a loco, non a speciebus, non a tempore, sed a persona nimirum quod qui ante fuerit clericus, sive in clericorum nomenclatura, nunc sit laicus et in laicorum ordine.

[36] Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, part 2. ch. 4. [Originally published, viz. part 2., in 1714, when the Author had become rector of Havant, Hants. It now forms the second portion of the ninth volume of this new edition. Ed.]

[37] C. 7. (t. 5. p. 297 e.) Si quis adulterasse aut confessus fuerit, vel convictus, depositus ab officio, communione concessa, in monasterio toto vitæ suæ tempore trudatur [al. retrudatur].

[38] C. 8. (ibid. e.) Si quis clericus

clergyman was convicted of theft or fraud, because those were capital crimes, he should be degraded from his order, and only be allowed lay-communion.' So in the Collection of Martin Bracarensis[39], made out of the Greek Canons for the use of the Spanish Church, it is ordered, 'that if any one is surreptitiously ordained, who after baptism has been guilty of murder, either by immediate commission of the fact, or by command, or counsel, or defence, he shall be deposed, and only be admitted to lay-communion all his days.' Gelasius has a like decree[40], made in the case of a presbyter, who, in a quarrel, struck out the eye of another: he orders him 'to be deposed from his office, and to be cloistered in a monastery, there to repent of the fact, and only to have lay-communion for his whole life.' And Gratian cites an order of the Council of Lerida[41] to the same purpose, 'that if clergymen, who are once corrected for their offence, shall relapse, and return to their vomit again, they shall not only be deprived of the dignity of their office, but continue all their lives incapable of receiving the communion even as laymen, which shall only be granted them at their last hour.'

Clergymen thus reduced seldom allowed to recover their ancient station.

4. The plain result of this discourse is, that *reducing a clergyman to the communion of laymen* was a total deprivation and divesting him of his office and orders. So that if he now pretended to act as a minister, his actions were reputed null and void, and as no other than the actions of a layman. The learned Dr. Forbes[42] has rightly observed this in the

furtum aut falsitatem admiserit, quia capitalia etiam ipsa sunt crimina, communione concessa, ab ordine degradetur.

[39] C. 26. (ibid. p. 909 a.) Si quis .... homicidii aut facto, aut præcepto, aut consilio, aut defensione [al. assentione], post baptismum conscius fuerit, et per aliquam surreptionem ad clericatum venerit, dejiciatur, et in finem vitæ suæ laicam communionem tantummodo recipiat [al. communionem non recipiat].

[40] Ep. ad Ruffin. ap. Gratian. distinct. 55. c. 13. (t. 1. p. 290. 56.) ... Bene fraternitas tua fecit ab officio eum presbyterii removere. Hoc tamen solicitudinis tuæ sit, ut locum ei pœnitentiæ constituas, et in aliquo eum monasterio retrudas, laica tantummodo sibi communione concessa.

[41] C. 5. distinct. 1. c. 52. (ibid. p. 261. 45.) Si iterato velut canes ad vomitum reversi fuerint; non solum dignitate officii careant, sed etiam sanctam communionem, nisi in exitu, non percipiant. [Conf. ap. Labb. (t. 4. p. 1612 b.) .... Quod si, &c. Ed.]

[42] Irenicum, l. 2. c. 11. (p. 222. juxt. Ed. Aberdeen, 1636. 4to.) Depositus depositione plena et perfecta non valide exercet ea, quæ sunt ordinis, quia ipso caret ordine et potestate ordinis. Et jam non nisi laicus est, et tanto deteriore conditione quam alii laici, quod longe

ancient discipline, and I cannot better express it than in his own words. 'He that is deposed with a plenary and perfect deposition cannot now validly exercise the offices that belong to this order, because he wants his order and the power of his order. He is now nothing but a mere layman, and in so much a worse condition than other laymen, because the restitution of such an one to his office is a much more difficult thing than the promotion of other laymen.' Indeed there are very few instances of recalling such to the clerical office again, which was never done but upon some great necessity or very pressing reason; as in the case of Maximus, the confessor, when he returned from the Novatian schism, and brought over a great multitude of the people with him; Cornelius, bishop of Rome, in regard to him as a confessor, and as one that had done good service to the Church by the influence of his example, dispensed with the general rule for his sake, and received him to his place in the presbytery again[43]; and the Council of Nice allowed the same favour to the Novatians, and the African fathers to the Donatists, with a charitable view, to put an end to those great and inveterate schisms. But these were only exceptions to the common rule, and dispensations with the general orders and standing discipline of the Church.

Notwithstanding the pretence of the indelible character of ordination.

5. It may perhaps be said there was still an inherent power and authority in such deposed clerks, and that their deposition did not totally annul their ordination: for they still retained the indelible character of their respective orders: and therefore they might be ministers still, and their ministerial actions stand good and authentic, notwithstanding any power and authority in the Church to depose and degrade them. But as this is next to a contradiction in itself, that a man should be deposed from his order, and yet retain his order still with all

difficilior sit ejus restitutio, quam aliorum laicorum promotio. [With Grischovius I cannot find these words according to the Ed. Antwerp. 1703, where (t. 1. p. 437. n. 13.) the *Depositio clerici plena et perfecta* is thus described;—Est ejus degradatio et dejectio ab officio, honore, dignitate, ordine, et communione clericali; adeo ut jam sacro ordine careat, nec in clericatu permaneat, nec in ordinatione ecclesiastica habendus sit, quippe ordinatione privatus, ordine et gradu nudatus, privatus, ab eoque separatus, ut illi in ecclesiasticis plus non sit relictum quam laico, puta ut ecclesiam ingrediatur, et laicam cum laicis, non autem clericalem cum clericis, communionem accipiat. Ed.]

[43] Vid. Ep. 46. [al. 49.] ad Cypr. p. 93. (p. 235.) .. Maximum presbyterum locum suum agnoscere jussimus.

the spiritual power belonging to it: so it implies such a notion of that which is commonly called *the indelible character of ordination*, as no ancient writer ever thought of. For the notion that the Ancients had of the indelible character of ordination was no more than they had of the indelible character of baptism; that as the outward form of baptism, washing or immersion in water, though but a transient act, served for ever to distinguish a Christian from a mere Heathen or Jew; so as that, though he apostatized from the Christian faith into Judaism or Gentilism, he should still retain so much of the Christian character, as upon his conversion and return to the faith not to need a second baptism: in like manner the outward form of ordination, which is imposition of hands designing a man to any clerical office, though it be but a transient act, was sufficient to distinguish such an one from a mere layman, who never had any such ceremony of ordination; so that by this mark or character of his office once received, though he should afterward forfeit his office and all the power and honour belonging to it, he would always remain distinguished in some measure from those who never had such an office; and though he should be wholly divested of his office and power, and reduced to the simple capacity and condition of a layman, yet so much of the marks and footsteps of his former office would remain upon him, as that if he should be recalled again to his office, though he might need a new commission, he would not need this outward character or ceremony of a new ordination.

There is no one has explained or illustrated the sense of the Ancients upon this point with more accuracy than the learned Dr. Forbes: and therefore, for further confirmation, I shall here transcribe his words. 'There remains,' says he[44], 'some distinguishing character in a man that is deposed, by which he

[44] Ubi supra, c. 11. (p. 224. juxt. Aberdeen, 1636. 4to.) Manet quidem in deposito aliquid distinctivum, quo ab aliis laicis distinguitur: ad distinctionem autem non est necessaria aliqua impressa forma, sed sufficit actus transiens in præteritum, nempe quod sit aliquando ordinatus. Manet indeposito non character præsentis alicujus officii aut potestatis, sed vestigium quoddam præteriti honoris et aliquando habitæ potestatis: per quod vestigium ab aliis laicis, nunquam ordinatis, distinguitur: et, peracta sufficienti pœnitentia, si idoneus inveniatur, et utilitas ecclesiæ postulet, restitui poterit absque nova ordinatione, &c. [This passage also is not to be found in the Antwerp edition of 1703; where see prop. 13. n. 9, &c. of the Dialogue between the Catholic and the Protestant: (t. 1. p. 436.) Degradatio vel est, &c. Ed.]

is distinguished from other laymen: but to make this distinction it is not necessary there should be any form impressed, but a transient act, that is long ago past, is sufficient, viz. that he was once a person ordained. The character that remains in a deposed person is not the character of any present office or power, but only some footstep or mark of an honour that is past, and of a power that he once had; by which footstep he is distinguished from other laymen, who never were ordained; and may, after a sufficient penance performed, if he be found fit, and the advantage of the Church so require, be bestowed again without a new ordination. As if a prince should imprint upon his nobles the marks and characters of the offices which they bear under him; making the impress or figure of a key upon the arm of his chamberlain with an hot iron, and the image of a horse upon the arm of the master of his horse, and the image of a cup upon the arm of his butler: and after this it should happen, that the prince being justly offended at them should depose them from their offices, and put others in their room, signing them with the characters of their offices likewise; those marks, which in the officers who were not deposed were characters of their present power, would in those that were deposed be only footsteps of their by-past power: and whatever thing they who were deposed should do relating to those offices, it would have no more validity than if it was done by any private man, who never bore any such office. Yet in this there would be a difference, that, if the prince pleased to restore those whom he had deposed, there would be no need to set a new mark upon them; but those footsteps or remains of their ancient power would now become again the character of their present power.'

By this illustration, which justly represents the sense of the Ancients, it is easy for any one to apprehend how far the discipline of the Church in deposing clergymen extended: namely, that it not only suspended them from the execution of their office, but deprived them of their office, and took away their orders from them; that they were thenceforth no more than laymen, only with this distinction, that they had the external character of a by-past office, which other laymen wanted; that now they had neither the office of clergymen, nor the power of it; nor were their actions of any other account in the Church

than as the actions of private men and laymen. Thus far the Church proceeded in her censures of clergymen that submitted to her discipline, and were not refractory and contumacious: she allowed them the benefit of lay-communion, which was a moderation of their punishment in regard to their submitting quietly to her discipline and censures.

But sometimes excommunicated, as well as deposed, and denied the communion of laymen.

6. But if they continued contumacious and stubborn, opposing her first censures, and acting as clergymen in contempt of them; she then proceeded one degree further with them, adding to their deposition a formal excommunication, and denying them even the communion of laymen. Thus Arius and many other first founders of heresies were anathematized and excommunicated, as well as degraded. And there are abundance of instances of the like proceeding in Cyprian[45], and the Apostolical Canons[46], and the Council of Sardica[47], and the Council of Cologne[48], and the Council of Eliberis[49], and the Council of Rome[50] under Felix III: all which, because I have

[45] Ep. 49. [al. 52.] ad Cornel. p. 96. (p. 237.).. Quibus [literis] et didicimus, et docere atque instruere cæteros cœpimus, Evaristum de episcopo jam nec laicum remansisse, cathedræ et plebis extorrem, et de ecclesia Christi exsulem, per alias longe provincias oberrare, &c.

[46] C. 29. [al. 27.] (Cotel. [c. 21.] v. 1. p. 441.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρεισθεὶς δικαίως ἐπὶ ἐγκλήμασι φανεροῖς, τολμήσειεν [ἐφ]άψασθαι τῆς πότε ἐγχειρισθείσης αὐτῷ λειτουργίας· οὗτος παντάπασιν ἐκκοπτέσθω τῆς ἐκκλησίας.*—C. 30. [Labb. c. 28.] (Cotel. [c. 22.] ibid.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος διὰ χρημάτων τῆς ἀξίας ταύτης ἐγκρατὴς γένηται, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρείσθω καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας, καὶ ἐκκοπτέσθω παντάπασι καὶ τῆς κοινωνίας, ὡς Σίμων ὁ μάγος ὑπ' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου.*

[47] C. 1. (t. 2. p. 628 c.) *Ἡγοῦμαι μηδὲ λαϊκῶν ἔχειν τοὺς τοιούτους χρῆναι κοινωνίαν.*—C. 2. (ibid. e.) ..... *Καθάπαξ οὖν τὰς ῥᾳδιουργίας τὰς τοιαύτας καὶ τέχνας κολαστέας εἶναι νομίζω, ὥστε μηδένα τοιοῦτον μηδὲ ἐν τῷ τέλει λαϊκῆς γοῦν ἀξιοῦσθαι κοινωνίας.*

[48] Ap. Crabb. t. 1. p. 317. (ap. Labb. t. 2. p. 615 e.) Quia Euphrata Christum Deum negat, consentio eum episcopum esse non posse; qui nec laicam debet communionem accipere.

[49] C. 18. [al. 19.] (t. 1. p. 973 a.) Episcopi, presbyteri, et diacones, si in ministerio positi, detecti fuerint, quod sint mœchati, placuit, et propter scandalum et propter profanum crimen, nec in fine eos communionem accipere debere.—C. 76. (ibid. p. 978 d.) Si quis diaconum se permiserit ordinari, et postea fuerit detectus in crimine mortis, quod aliquando commiserit; si sponte fuerit confessus, placuit eum, acta legitima pœnitentia, post triennium accipere communionem. Quod si alius eum detexerit, post quinquennium, acta pœnitentia, accipere communionem laicam debere.

[50] Roman. 3. sub Felice 3. c. 2. (t. 4. p. 1076 b.) Quia idem Dominus atque Salvator clementissimus est, et neminem vult perire, usque ad exitus sui diem, in pœnitentia, si resipiscunt, jacere conveniet: nec orationi non modo fidelium, sed ne catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communio laica tantum in morte reddenda est.

produced at large upon another occasion [51], I think it needless to repeat in this place.

7. We are likewise to observe, that in case of contumacious contempt of her censures, the Church sometimes had recourse to the secular powers; craving their aid and assistance, either to remove a stubborn clerk from his station and honourable post in the Church, which he obstinately detained after deposition, or else to inflict some other punishment upon him for his chastisement and correction. We have seen several instances of this before [52] in the general account of the exercise of discipline upon all church-members, related from Eusebius and the Council of Antioch, and the third Council of Carthage, and the African Code, where addresses are made, or appointed to be made, to the secular powers, some Heathen and some Christian, imploring their assistance to remove some obstinate and contumacious bishops and presbyters from their places, when they would not obey the decrees of the Church, but retain their offices and preferments in spite of her censures.

Sometimes removed and corrected by the assistance and authority of the secular power.

And of these I need not be more particular in this place: as neither of those other various temporal penalties, which the wisdom of the State thought fit to inflict upon heretics in general, laymen as well as clergymen, to discountenance heterodoxy, and give more effectual force and vigour to the censures of the Church: for of these I have given a sufficient account in discoursing of the punishments of heresy in the [sixth chapter of the] former Book.

8. But there was one particular civil punishment peculiar to delinquent clergymen, which must be taken notice of in this place. The ancient law comprises it under the name of *curiæ tradi, delivering up to the secular court:* which, as Gothofred [53] observes, has a different meaning in the ancient law

What meant by the punishment called *curiæ tradi*, or *delivering up to the secular court.*

[51] Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, part 2. ch. 5. See n. 36, preceding.

[52] B. 16. ch. 2. s. 3. v. 6. p. 64.

[53] In Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episc. leg. 39. (t. 6. p. 79.) Depositus seu exauctoratus episcopi judicio, velut indignus clericatu et ob improbitatem, vel etiam spontaneus clericatus desertor, prout natales et facultates ejus sunt, vel curiæ vel collegio civitatis suæ sociari, non etiam ad militiam seu officia quæcunque admitti, id est, officiales judicum fieri, hac Honorii constitutione A.D. 408, quam memorat Justinianus et firmat l. 53. § 1. Cod. de Episcopis, jubetur; pœna duarum librarum auri decemprimis curialium indicta, si cum aliquibus colluserint. Decemprimos scilicet curiæ solicitudo respiciebat, ut ne

from that which the modern use and practice has put upon it. For among the modern canonists it signifies 'delivering a clergyman up to the secular judge after degradation, to be punished for some great crime with death, or such capital punishment as the Church had no power to inflict upon him:' but in the old law the *curia* has a larger sense, not only to denote a judge's court, but the corporation of any city, the members of which were commonly called *decuriones* and *curiales*. In this there were some honourable, and some servile offices; and therefore, when a clergyman was degraded for any offence, and reduced to the quality of a layman, then, besides that he lost all the privileges and exemptions that by law and imperial favour belonged to the clergy, he was obliged to serve the *curia* or *secular corporation* of his city, and that many times only in some mean office and servile condition, by way of additional civil punishment for having transgressed the laws of the Church, and the rules of his sacred profession and venerable function. And this was a certain way of precluding him from all hopes ever after of regaining his clerical dignity again: for as the laws absolutely prohibited any of the *curiales* to be ordained at first [54], because they were tied to certain municipal and civil offices inconsistent with the spiritual; so if any of the clergy were once degraded and taken into the power of the secular *curia* or *corporation*, there was no possibility of their returning to the ecclesiastical state again. And therefore Honorius made this a law, that the *curia* should immediately lay hold of such delinquents, to render their punishment irreversible and perpetual. 'If a bishop,' says the law [55], 'shall condemn any clergyman as unworthy of his office, and separate

qui curiæ obnoxii elaberentur. Illud ex hac lege vulgo colligitur, pœnæ loco quem olim curiæ deditum.... Neque enim pœnæ loco hac lege clerici curiæ tradi jubentur: verum ecclesiasticos, ecclesia dejectos vel ecclesiam sponte deserentes, curiæ tradi ceu vacantes jam. Quo autem sensu voluerint Pontificiarum Epistolarum auctores curiæ tradi clericos episcopis suis contumaces, veluti Pii Epist. 2. pag. 199., et Fabiani 2. p. 300., Stephani 2. p. 337., canonistæ tumultuantur.

[54] See b. 4. ch. 4. s. 4. v. 2. p. 58, and b. 5. ch. 3. ss. 15, 16. v. 2. pp. 151, 152.

[55] Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 39. (t. 6. p. 78.) Quemcunque clericum indignum officio suo episcopus judicaverit, et ab ecclesiæ ministerio segregaverit: aut si quis professum sacræ religionis sponte dereliquerit, continuo sibi eum curia vindicet: ut liber illi ultra ad ecclesiam recursus esse non possit; et, pro hominum qualitate, et quantitate patrimonii, vel ordini

him from the ministry of the Church; or if any one voluntarily desert his sacred profession, let the *curia* immediately lay claim to him, that he may no longer be at liberty to return to the Church again; and according to the quality of the man, or the quality of his estate, let him either be taken into the *curia*, or some collegiate company of the city, and be obliged to undergo those public burdens or necessities which he shall be found qualified for, and this without any collusion, under the penalty of a forfeiture of a considerable sum of gold, to be levied upon the *decemprimi, the ten principal men of the curia*, if they connived at any such collusion: and the offending clerk so degraded is further tied up by a negative punishment never to hold any office or place under any of the secular judges.' Justinian renewed and confirmed this law in one of his Novels[56], and by another[57] imposed a like punishment upon any monk that should desert his monastery to betake himself to any secular employment: such an one was to serve all his life in some mean and servile office under the judge of the province; and only have this fruit of his change, that for despising his sacred ministry he should be tied to the slavish attendance upon an earthly tribunal.

But besides this, there was another way of delivering over delinquent clergymen to the secular courts and civil judges; which was, when they committed such crimes as were properly of civil cognizance, and might be heard and punished as crimes against the state and commonwealth. For clergymen were considered in a double capacity, as ministers of the Church, and as members of the commonwealth. Whatever crimes they committed in the first capacity, they were indeed liable pri-

suo, vel collegio civitatis, adjungatur: modo ut quibuscunque apti erunt publicis necessitatibus obligentur, ita ut colludio quoque locus non sit. Per singulos igitur binæ libræ auri inferendæ ærario nostro a decem primis curialibus exigantur, si aliquibus illicitam cohibentiam et colludia fœda præstiterint; hominibusque improbissimis ab omnibus officiis militiæ aditus obstinatur.

[56] Novel. 123. c. 14. (t. 5. p. 547.) Si vero post ordinationem presbyter, aut diaconus, aut subdiaconus, uxorem duxerit; expellatur a clero, et curiæ civitatis illius, in qua clericus erat, cum propriis rebus tradatur.

[57] Novel. 5. c. 6. (t. 5. p. 46. ad calc.).... Substantia ejus etiam sic in monasterio.... remanente, ipse inter officiales clarissimi provinciæ judicis statuetur: et hunc habebit mutationis fructum, ut, qui sacrum ministerium despexit, tribunalis terreni observet servitium.

marily to be judged by the bishops of the Church, as the proper judges of ecclesiastical causes: yet if their crimes were very flagrant, such as heresy or simony, though these were properly ecclesiastical causes, yet the criminals might be turned over to the secular judges, after the ecclesiastical sentence was passed upon them: for such crimes were punished both by Church and State with their respective censures. If their crimes were such as more nearly and directly affected the peace and tranquillity of the commonwealth; such as treason, and sedition, and murder, and robbery, and the practice of magical and pernicious arts; in that case bishops not only might, but were obliged, *ex officio*, to turn over a degraded clerk to the secular court and a competent judge, to be punished according to the quality of his offences.

There is a famous instance relating to this matter in the history of the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon [58], reported out of the Acts of the Council of Tyre, where Ibas, bishop of Edessa, was accused for intending to promote one Abraamius, a deacon, to a bishopric, when he had confessed himself guilty of magical practices before the bishop and all the clergy: and it is added by way of aggravation of the bishop's fault, that he kept the paper of his magical enchantments by him, when he ought to have presented the execrable criminal to the judge of the province, according as the laws directed. By which one instance, it is easy to apprehend, that there were some crimes both of ecclesiastical and civil cognizance: and when any such clergyman was deposed, in an ecclesiastical court, the bishop was obliged to remit him to a secular judge, to be punished with civil punishments as a layman, according to the nature and quality of his offences. And in this case, I conceive they treated him as an excommunicate person, not barely reduced to lay-communion, but one degree lower, being thrust down to the lowest rank of notorious criminals, and denied the common benefit and privilege of those who were allowed to partake of the communion of laymen. Of which kind of censure, there are several instances in the Apostolical

[58] Act. 10. (t. 4. p. 647 c.) Καὶ ἔχει παρακατασχὼν τὸν χάρτην τῶν γοητευτικῶν ἐπικλήσεων ὁ εὐλαβέστατος ἡμῶν ἐπίσκοπος, ὀφείλων τῷ ἄρχοντι τῆς ἐπαρχίας τὸ ἀπηγορευμένον προσενεγκεῖν, κατὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν νόμων.

Canons, and the Councils of Eliberis, Cologne, and Sardica; which, because I have produced them at large upon another occasion[59], I forbear to relate in this place, and proceed to another inquiry concerning the punishment, which was commonly called *communio peregrina*, or *reducing clergymen to the communion of strangers.*

CHAP. III.

Of the punishment called communio peregrina, or reducing clergymen to the communion of strangers.

The several canons, wherein this punishment is mentioned.

1. THERE is no one question in all the ancient discipline that has more exercised the pens of learned men, than this about the punishment called *communio peregrina, the communion of strangers.* It plainly appears from all the canons wherein any mention is made of it, that some punishment is intended to be peculiarly inflicted on the clergy for some special offences; but it is not so easy to discover what sort of punishment it was. I will first set down the canons that mention it, and then the different sentiments of learned men concerning it, pointing out that which seems to be the most rational account of it, with some confirmation out of ancient history.

The first Council that mentions it is the Council of Riez[60], anno 439, where it is determined in the case of a schismatical bishop returning to the Catholic Church, 'that he shall only be allowed to be a *chorepiscopus* in some country-church under another bishop, or else be content with *the communion of strangers.*' The next Council that mentions it is the Council of Agde, anno 506, where in one canon[61] it is determined, 'that if any clergyman be found guilty of robbing the church, he shall be reduced to the communion of strangers.' And in another[62], 'that if any contumacious clerk despises the com-

[59] Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, part 2. ch. 5. See n. 36. preceding.

[60] C. 3. (t. 3. p. 1286 e.)... Liceat et in unam parochiarum suarum ecclesiam cedere, in qua aut chorepiscopi nomine,.... aut peregrina, ut aiunt, communione foveatur.

[61] C. 5. (t. 4. p. 1483 d.) Si quis clericus furtum ecclesiæ fecerit, peregrina ei communio tribuatur.

[62] C. 2. (ibid. b.) Contumaces vero clerici... ab episcopis corripiantur [al. corrigantur]: et si qui, prioris gradus elati superbia, communionem fortasse contempserint, aut ecclesiam frequentare vel officium su-

munion, or neglects to frequent the church, or fulfil his office, he shall be reduced to the communion of strangers, so as that, when he repents and reforms, he may have his name written again in the *matricula*, or *roll of the clergy*, and obtain his degree and dignity as before among them.' After this, in the Council of Lerida, anno 539, we find a like decree[63], 'that in case any clergyman upon the death of the bishop pillage his house, or suppress any thing by fraud to the detriment of his successor, he shall be reputed guilty of sacrilege, and condemned with the greater excommunication, and at the utmost only be allowed the communion of strangers.'

These are the canons wherein this punishment, or moderation of punishment, (call it which you please,) is mentioned: but so little light can be had from the canons themselves, as to the nature of the punishment, that it is no great wonder that learned men have run into various opinions about it.

The communion of strangers not the same as lay-communion.

2. Some confound it altogether with lay-communion, as Binius, in his Notes upon the Council of Lerida[64], and Hospinian[65], and the old Gloss upon Gratian[66]. But it is no ways probable, that the ancient Church would use two such different names for the same thing, when *lay-communion* was a word so

um implere neglexerint, peregrina eis communio tribuatur, ita ut cum eos pœnitentia correxerit, rescripti in matricula gradum suum dignitatemque suscipiant [al. recipiant].

[63] C. 15. [al. 16.] (ibid. p. 1614 b.) Si quisquam... clericus quacunque occasione... quidpiam probatus fuerit abstulisse, vel forsitan dolo aliquo suppressisse, reus sacrilegii, prolixiori anathemate condemnetur, et vix quoque peregrina ei communio [animæ] concedatur.

[64] In eund. can. (t. 3. p. 818 d. 5. Ap. Labb. t. 4. p. 1617 a.)... Existimo laicam et peregrinam communionem idem esse, nullumque discrimen inter utramque versari.

[65] Hist. Sacrament. l. 2. c. 1. (p. 24.), where he cites the canon of the Council of Agde, (see n. 61, just before,) and takes *peregrina communio* as synonymous with *laica*.

[66] Caus. 13. quæst. 2. c. 11. [Such is the reference without citation which the Author gives, doubtless according to the edition of the Corpus Juris Canonici which he had at hand, viz. Romæ, 1582. in 4 vols. folio. Grischovius, who used a Cologne edition, 1717, 2 vols. 4to., gives the words of the gloss thus: *Peregrina, quæ alias dicitur laica.* Neither of those editions have I seen; but in no other that I have examined can I find those exact words. According to the early Lyons edition of 1518, and the later of 1671, in 3 vols. folio, the gloss on the words, (t. 1. p. 1034. 66.) Si quis autem clericus furtum ecclesiæ fecerit, peregrina ei communio tribuatur, reads thus, *Id est, commorabitur inter laicos.* I apprehend that Grischovius has mistaken, and that the words, which he gives as the *old gloss* on this term, come from Hospinian or some other place, where there is an *idem color*; or that some alteration of the marginal text has been made. Ed.]

commonly known among them. Besides that these two things were evidently different from one another: for clergymen reduced to lay-communion, were totally and perpetually degraded from their orders, and could not ordinarily be restored to their office again, but ever after continued in the state of laymen, as has been evidently demonstrated in the foregoing chapter: whereas clergymen reduced to the communion of strangers, were still capable of being restored to their office again after the performance of a certain penance, as is expressly said in the forementioned canon[67] of the Council of Agde.

Nor communion in one kind.

3. Bellarmin[68] and others not only take it for lay-communion, but boldly assert, that that lay-communion was communion only in one kind: so that when a clergyman is said to be reduced to lay-communion, it is the same thing, according to them, as being put down to receive the communion among laymen in one kind. But this is only multiplying obscurities, and confounding a reader, by adding one error to another. For, as the Ancients speak of *lay-communion* and *the communion of strangers* as different things, so they had no such notion of lay-communion as these writers pretend: for all public communion both of clergy and laity in the primitive Church was in both kinds, as has been evidently demonstrated in a former Book[69], and is now ingenuously confessed by the most learned and accurate writers in the Romish Church. So that this opinon which confounds the communion of strangers with communion in one kind, is without all shadow of truth, and has not the least foundation in antiquity to support it.

Nor communion at the hour of death.

4. The author of the Gloss upon Gratian[70] has another pleasant interpretation: for he fancies it may signify 'communion at the hour of death, when a man leaves the world, and departs out of this life to take a pilgrimage into the next life and world to come.' But this is only fit to make an intelligent reader smile: for it is very improper to call death *a pilgrimage*, which more strictly speaking, according to Scripture

[67] C. 2. See n. 62, preceding.

[68] De Eucharist. l. 4. c. 24. p. 679. (t. 3. p. 750 a.) Eadem [laica] communicatio dicitur etiam peregrina in Concilio Agathensi, c. 2. et 5.

[69] B. 15. ch. 5. s. 1. v. 5. p. 405.

[70] Ubi supra. (Ed. Lugdun. 1671. t. 1. p. 1034. not. margin. o.) Peregrina communio, id est, cum recedit, vel peregrinatur de hoc mundo.—See also n. 66, preceding.

language, is rather a translating of men to their native country, their heaven and their home. Men are said to be strangers and pilgrims upon earth, because they are absent from heaven, the city and country to which they belong: therefore *leaving this world* cannot be said to be entering upon a pilgrimage, but, in propriety, rather ending and finishing a pilgrimage, to go to their everlasting home. Therefore, if the Ancients spake properly, as no doubt they did, they could not mean by *the communion of strangers* the communion of dying persons, or such as were taking a pilgrimage out of this world. Besides that the very canon of the Council of Agde, which the glosser pretends to explain, makes the communion of strangers not to be the communion of dying persons, but such as are living, and in a capacity to return to officiate as clergymen, after a sufficient correction, in their former station.

Nor the communion of such as were enjoined to go on pilgrimages on earth by way of penance, a piece of discipline unknown to the Ancients.

5. Cardinal Bona[71] mentions and exposes another more fanciful opinion of one Gabriel Henao, who, he says, wrote a long Dissertation upon this subject[72], wherein he at last concludes, 'that the communion of strangers was that which was given to such clergymen as were enjoined to go on pilgrimages, either temporary or perpetual, by way of penance for their offences.' But he no way explains what kind of communion this was; and as Bona observes, he ought to have demonstrated, that when the canons about the communion of strangers were made, there was any such punishment as pilgrimages enjoined the clergy for the expiation of their offences. For there is a profound silence in antiquity as to what concerns any such injunction.

[71] Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 19. n. 5. (p. 328.) Alia est singularis sententia Gabrielis Henao, qui Lib. de Sacrific. Missæ, p. 3. disputat. 28. sect. 49. et sequentibus, diffusissime agens de communione peregrina, eam tandem fuisse concludit, ad quam clerici admittebantur, quibus in pœnam alicujus peccati peregrinationes, sive perpetuæ sive ad tempus, impositæ erant. Sed quamvis multa dicat, non tamen probat, quæ et qualis fuerit peregrinantium communio. Et hoc deinde ab illo demonstrari oportebat, quod, quando canones de communione peregrina editi sunt, solerent clericis ad expianda peccata peregrinationes injungi.

[72] De Sacrificio Missæ, part. 3. disput. 28. n. 49. [I have not been able to meet with a copy of this work, Lugdun. 1655. fol. It may also be found in Nathaniel Southwell's Continuation of Ribadeneyra. See the last edition of the Bodleian Catalogue: (v. 3. p. 510.) Sotvellus, Anglice Southwell, e Soc. Jesu. Continuatio Bibliothecæ Scriptt. Soc. Jesu Petri de Ribadeneyra, q. v. fol. Rom. 1676. Ed.]

6. Cassander[73] and Vossius[74], after some of the schoolmen and canonists, think the communion of strangers means 'the oblation of the eucharist made after some peculiar rite, and on some particular days, for the use of strangers; and that it was put upon delinquent clergymen as a punishment to communicate with these.' But there was no such custom as this of making any particular oblation of the eucharist for strangers in the ancient Church: for all travellers and strangers, when they came to a foreign Church, if they brought communicatory or commendatory letters with them, were admitted to communicate with the Church wherever they happened to sojourn: and if they did not bring communicatory letters, they were denied communion till they should procure them. Meanwhile they were allowed to communicate in external good things, or partake of the charity of the Church, if they were in necessity, though they were debarred from all religious communion as suspected persons. And by this distinction we shall be able to come at the true meaning of the communion of strangers.

Nor any private and peculiar oblation for strangers.

7. For we are to observe, that *communion* in the ancient Church signifies not only partaking of the eucharist, or communion of the altar; but also partaking of the charity of the Church. And such travellers as came to any foreign Church without communicatory letters, to testify their orthodoxy and pious conversation, were presumed to be under some censure, and not in actual communion with their own Church: till therefore they could clear themselves of this suspicion, by the rules of the Catholic unity, and communion of all Churches mutually with one another, they were to be refused communion in a foreign Church, and only to be allowed common charity as strangers. And according to these measures,

But communicating only as strangers travelling without commendatory letters, who might partake of the Church's charity, but not of the communion of the altar.

[73] De Communione sub utraque Specie. (p. 1029. post med.) Idem de peregrina communione, cujus in Agathensi Synodo mentio fit, censendum puto: intelligi videlicet eam communionem inter peregrinos, seu cum peregrinis. Constat enim ex B. Ambrosio, præter statos dies, quibus incolis bis in hebdomada mysteria celebrabantur, nonnunquam extra ordinem, fere quotidie peregrinis adventantibus, mysteria celebrari et administrari solere.

[74] Thes. Theolog. disput. 23. thes. 5. p. 516. (t. 6. p. 447.) Nec magis pontificios juvat communio peregrina: ut qua proprie significetur oblatio, quæ præter statos dies peregrinantium causa fiebat.... Hinc peregrina communione communicare dicebantur, qui inter peregrinos communicabant. Eam vero etiam inter clericorum pœnas fuisse, clarissime liquet ex canone hoc primo Concilii Agathensis: *Contumaces clerici, etc.* See n. 62, preceding.

clergymen, who were delinquents, were for some time treated much after the same manner, and thereupon said to be *reduced to the communion of strangers:* that is, they might neither officiate as clergymen in celebrating the eucharist, nor any other part of their office; nor in some cases participate in the eucharist for some time, till they had made satisfaction; but only be allowed a charitable subsistence out of the revenues of the Church, without any legal claim to a full proportion, till by a just penance they could regain their former office and station.

This is the most probable account that can be given of a difficult and doubtful matter, and learned men now generally concur in the substance of this explication; as the reader that is curious may see in the writings of Albaspinæus[75], Bona[76],

[75] Observat. l. 1. c. 3. (ad calc. Optat. p. 12 c.).... Quæ [communio peregrina] nihil aliud est, nisi me fallit opinio, quam communitas et consociatio, quæ presbyteris sive aliis clericis, qui sine formatis aut commendatitiis literis peregrinabantur, indulgebatur in societate clericorum et communione ecclesiastica. Ea de causa literæ formatæ subintroductæ sunt. Inde etiam veteres canones omnem curam et cautionis omne genus adhibent, ut fideles a consortio et societate peccatorum secludantur. Quando igitur episcopus, presbyter, clericus peregrinabantur, placuit, ut nullus episcoporum navigaret sine formata primatis: item, ut clerici sine formata et conscientia episcopi per alienas plebes non vagarentur. Tum demum, ut nullus peregrinus sine formata episcopi acciperetur, super quibus literis episcopi, ad quos facilis aditus patebat, scribebant peregrinis illac iter fuisse, visisque literis eorum, a quibus profecti erant, communionem indulsisse: alioqui peregrinus ille non accipiebatur, neque ulli rei ecclesiasticæ aut civili cum clericis diœcesis, qua illi iter erat, communicabat, et quasi excommunicatus habebatur. Verum enim vero quamvis frons, oculi, vultus persæpe mentiantur, oratio vero sæpissime, si tamen peregrino literæ formatæ excidissent, si interceptæ aut alio quovis casu amissæ fuissent, aut episcopus quacunque tandem de causa eas denegavisset; vel si qua tandem suspicio subesset; non omnino rejiciebatur, quia dubitatio oboriebatur, num vera essent, quæ allegaret. Itaque non ea injuria afficiebatur, ut excommunicatis annumeraretur; sed neque ad communionem ecclesiæ admittebatur, ne [cum excommunicatis communicare videretur], aut ovis morbosa et tabida, quæ gregem inficeret, in caulam Domini nostri Jesu Christi intraret: sed seorsim sumptibus ecclesiæ in loco semoto alebatur, ubi orabat, et in eo statu erat, ut laicus non esset, nec tamen communioni ecclesiæ participabat, neque ullis clerici muneribus defungebatur, id videre est in 32. canone Apostolorum: (CC. t. 1. p. 31 c.) *Nemo peregrinorum episcoporum, aut presbyterorum, aut diaconorum, sine commendatitiis suscipitor literis; et, si eas obtulerit, attentius in disquisitionem vocantor. Et quidem si prædicatores pietatis fuerint, suscipiuntor; sin minus, ubi necessaria eis suppeditaveritis, ad communionem et ulteriorem ipsos consuetudinem non admittitote: multa enim per surreptionem fiunt.* Quo canone, mea quidem sententia, exponitur, quid sit communio peregrina, quæ ab initio non erat genus pœnæ et

Schelstrate[77], Priorius[78], Petavius[79], Dominicy[80], and Sir-

animadversionis, sed instituta fuerat, ut clerici, de quorum statu et conditione non constaret, non omnino rejicerentur. Postea vero hoc eodem genere communionis usa est ecclesia, ut clericos non peregrinos in officio contineret; et ita factum est, ut hæc communio genus quoddam pœnæ censeretur.... Est locus quidam insignis in Vita Sancti Joannis Chrysostomi, qui huic observationi multum lucis affundere potest: *Si placet, inquiunt, domine, spiritualis communionis nondum illis consortium trade, ne papam contristes; cæterum in aliis omnia in eos officia humanitatis exerce, id enim tibi episcopo convenit, ita illos excepit Joannes, ad communionem minime admittit.* Hac peregrinæ communionis specie ecclesia punivit non solum clericos peregrinos: sed eos etiam, qui in diœcesi habebant domicilium, quod degradationis, sive suspensionis a muneribus ecclesiæ, et separationis a cæteris clericis genus est, tam in rebus civilibus, quam ecclesiasticis. Hinc patet, ut mea fert opinio, quid fuerit communio peregrina, et unde denominationem acceperit.

[76] Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 19. n. 6. (p. 328.) Sirmondus in *Historia Publicæ Pœnitentiæ, cap. ult.*, et Albaspinæus, Lib. 1. Observat., tunc peregrina communione mulctatos fuisse clericos crediderunt, quando in eo loco et statu collocabantur, quo poni solebant clerici peregrini, qui sine literis commendatitiis, quas *formatas* vocabant, extra propriam diœcesim peregrinabantur. Excipi enim benigne consueverant et sumptibus ecclesiæ ali, nullo prætermisso humanitatis officio: nemo tamen clericorum cum illis, tanquam cum clericis, communicabat, nec ullis sui ordinis muneribus fungebantur.... Hoc autem advenis nulla erat pœna, sed sic ferebat usus ecclesiæ, ut clerici vagantes sine formatis ad suorum ordinum exercitia in aliena diœcesi non admitterentur: quæ cautio etiam hodie adhibetur, ut ignoti et extranei sacerdotes non permittantur celebrare, nisi literas suæ ordinationis ostendant: tametsi in reliquis omnia illis officia Christianæ caritatis impendantur. Cum vero clerici alicui ecclesiæ ascripti functiones sui ordinis exercere prohibebantur, id sane pœna erat in hoc sita, quod licet peregrini non essent, certumque domicilium et gradum in propria civitate et ecclesia obtinerent, sic tamen cum eis agebatur, ac si peregrini forent, de quorum statu et conditione non constaret. Cumque sui ordinis exercitio carerent, non tamen abstenti erant a perceptione eucharistiæ, quæ nec peregrinis quidem et ignotis negabatur, cum se vere orthodoxos esse docuissent.

[77] C. Antioch. Restitut. (Dissert. 4. c. 12. art. 3. nn. 1, 2. p. 397.)... Dissentire non possum ab illis, quæ recte animadvertit Philippus Priorius in Dissertatione *de Literis Canonicis*, titul. 11. *Literæ canonicæ ideo concedebantur, etc.* Ex hisce jam spes affulget exponendi canones [2. et 5.] Agathensis Concilii de communione peregrina tractantes.... Sunt, qui peregrinam communionem interpretati sunt de communione sub unica specie, sed nullatenus verisimile videtur, illam pro tam gravi et enormi crimine in pœnam infligi, cum tamen canones et Ilerdenses citati communionem peregrinam imposuerint in pœnam, unde rectius Gabriel Albaspinæus, doctissimus Aurelianensium antistes, libro 1. observat. 3., *Communio peregrina, etc.*

[78] De Lit. Canon. titt. 11, 12. (pp. 37–39.) Literæ canonicæ ideo concedebantur, ut peregrinantes sublevarentur harum beneficio, quod communionis Christianæ, sive etiam communicationis nomine insigniebatur. Atque in eo sita erat illa communio, ut religionis societate fruerentur et mysteriorum consortio, modo adessent ejusmodi literæ ex antiquorum canonum decretis conscriptæ. Qui autem hac ope destitutus ad iter se accingebat, a fratribus quidem humaniter accipiebatur; ei tamen communionis tantum pere-

mond[81]; not to mention the hints and strictures occasionally made about it by Lindanus[82], Baronius[83], and Peter de Marca[84], all writers of the Romish communion; whom I the rather name upon this account, to expose more fully the vanity of Bellarmin and his adherents, who, with a great deal of con-

grinæ jure frui licebat, id est, quod ad naturæ jura pertinet, ad omne genus solatii, ad ea, quæ ad vitam erant necessaria, benigne et comiter agebatur cum peregrinis; in iis vero, quæ sacramentorum erant, ea severitate procedebant, ut absque literis penitus sacrorum communio denegaretur. Erant enim tunc quasi suspecti; nec satis apparebat, an vere essent Christiani; aut dubium erat, ne criminis aut sceleris cujuspiam rei essent. Nihil evidentius in hanc rem afferri potest, quam id, quod habet Synesius, Epist. 66. p. 38. Edit. Turnebi, de Alexandro episcopo.... Scribit igitur Synesius: *Nosti igitur, venerande pater, quomodo me gessi: in ecclesiam eum non admisi, neque sacræ mensæ participem feci; domi tamen eundem honorem largitus sum, qui insontibus impendi solet.* See n. 86, following.

[79] Not. in Synesii Epist. 67. [De Pœnitent. et Reconcil. Diatrib. c. 4.] (p. 78. ad summ.) Quocirca peregrina communio, qualem Regensis Concilii canon ille significat, non ex eo more dicta derivataque videtur, quo peregrini clerici, qui sine formatis literis advenirent, ac de quorum statu vel juris integritate dubitari poterat, ab episcopis tractabantur: sed inde potius, quod in aliena ecclesia peregrini episcopi vel clerici nullum ministerii ac functionis ordini suo consentaneæ obeundæ jus habeant. Tametsi ab earum civitatum, in quibus peregrinabantur, episcopis adhiberentur ad illa præstanda. Sed ex eo præcise, quod suis locis egressi usu ordinis sui careant; inde peregrina communio, quæ quidem pœnalis fuit, appellata videtur, qua similiter ac peregrini in civitatibus suis jus nullum haberent ordinis exercendi.

[80] [Marc. Anton. de Dominis: Ad Canonem 2. et 5. C. Agathensis, et ult. Ilerdensis, sive De Communione Peregrina. (Paris. 1645. 4to.) No special reference is given. Ed.]

[81] Histor. Pœnitent. c. ult. (t. 4. p. 511 b. 4.) De clericis agi [in canone secundo Agathensi] liquet, qui unum in corpus allecti sunt, unaque in matricula conscripti divino cultui una deserviunt. Quorum si qui ab officio per contumaciam discesserint, synodi decreto ex matricula expuncti, graduque summoti, peregrinorum in ordinem rediguntur, ut peregrina cum iis communione contenti sint. Sic tamen, ut, quando resipiscent, locum suum recipiant, matriculæque et corpori, a quo segregati sunt, restituantur, etc.

[82] Panoplia, l. 4. c. 58. (p. 501.) Quare peregrinam communionem fuisse apparet, non quæ ad conciones admittebat audiendas, odasve Christo cantandas, sive ad missam, quæ catechumenorum dicebatur;... sed quæ ad eam, quæ in precibus fratrum, id est, Christianorum a sacris non abstentorum neque a sacramentis exclusorum, erat communio, admittebat clericos suo gradu deturbatos.—Conf. ibid. (p. 502.).. Ignotos peregrinos ob excommunicationis suspicionem ad communes quidem preces fuisse admissos, &c.

[83] An. 400. p. 119. (t. 5. p. 121 e.) Peregrina tantum communione eos a Joanne Chrysostomo dignatos esse, qua sacrarum precum communicatio impartitur, non autem usus sacramentorum, Sozomenus tradit. Vigebat namque illa vetus in ecclesia consuetudo, ut peregrini advenientes, seque Christianos esse profitentes, ad communes tantum ecclesiæ preces admitterentur; tunc vero et sacramenta illis impertirentur, cum se esse Catholicos fide certa docuissent.

[84] Tractat. in Cap. *Clericus*, ad calcem Baluzii de Emendat. Gratiani. p. 585. See n. 29, preceding.

fidence, would persuade the world that they had discovered the lay-communion of their Church under one species, as they call it, in this ancient communion of strangers, when yet they differ as much almost as any two things from one another. Among Protestant writers, the true notion is well expressed by Dr. Sherlock[85], when he observes, 'that the ancient discipline was very severe in admitting strangers, who were unknown to them, to the communion; lest they should admit heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicated persons: and therefore if any such came, who could not produce their recommendatory letters, but pretended to have lost them by the way, they were neither admitted to communion, nor wholly refused, but, if occasion were, they were maintained by the Church, till such letters could be procured from the Church from whence they came, which was called the *communio peregrina.*

This notion confirmed from several parts of ancient history.

8. This notion seems the more agreeable because it comes recommended and confirmed by several facts in ancient history. Synesius, writing to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, concerning one Alexander, bishop of Basinopolis in Bithynia, who lay under some suspicion at Ptolemais, tells him[86], he 'neither received him in the church, nor communicated with him at the holy table, but in his own house he treated him as an innocent person.' And thus the historians[87] tell us Chrysostom treated the Egyptian monks, who, being prosecuted by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, fled to Constantinople, to have a fair hearing of their cause before the emperor: 'he entertained them hospitably, and allowed them to join in the common prayers with the Church, but would not admit them to participate at the eucharist, whilst their cause was depending and undetermined.' From which it is evident, that strangers travelling without recommendatory letters might be allowed some common offices of Christian charity, but could not be ad-

[85] Of Church-Unity, in Defence of Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation. (p. 602.)

[86] Ep. 66. ad Theotimum [leg. Theophilum]. (p. 207 b. 9.).... Ἐκκλησίᾳ μὲν οὐκ ἐδεξάμην αὐτὸν, οὐδὲ τραπέζας ἱερᾶς ἐκοινώνησα· οἴκοι δὲ ἴσα καὶ τοῖς ἀναιτίοις ἐτίμησα.

[87] Socrat. l. 6. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 324. 3.) Ἐν τιμῇ μὲν ἦγε τοὺς ἄνδρας, καὶ τῶν εὐχῶν μετέχειν οὐκ ἐκώλυσε· κοινωνίαν δὲ τῶν μυστηρίων οὐκ ἔφη πρὸ διαγνώσεως μεταδώσειν αὐτοῖς.—Sozom. l. 8. c. 13. (ibid. p. 342. 36.) Ὁ δὲ [Ἰωάννης] προσελθόντας αὐτῷ τοὺς ἄνδρας φιλοφρόνως ἐδέξατο, καὶ ἐν τιμῇ εἶχε, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ἐπὶ ἐκκλησίας οὐ διεκώλυσε· κοινωνεῖν δὲ μυστηρίων αὐτοῖς οὐχ ἡγήσατο, ὡς οὐ θεμιτὸν πρὸ διαγνώσεως τοῦτο ποιεῖν.

allowed clergymen to recover their office and dignity by doing penance, when these canons for doing penance so plainly took it from them? To this it is easily answered by distinguishing between *public* and *private* penance. The canons, which forbid clergymen to be restored to their office after having done penance, speak of *public* penance done solemnly in the church; but the other canons, which allow them to be restored, speak of *private* penance only. And that this is no arbitrary distinction, but of the Church's own making, is evident from the canons themselves. For the Council of Girone[95] allows such as have done private penance in time of sickness, and received absolution upon it, afterwards to be ordained, provided they never were brought to do public penance in the church, and there was no other objection of immorality to be made against them. In like manner Gennadius[96], recounting the several things that hindered a man from being ordained, reckons his having done public penance a sufficient objection against him: but as for private penance, he takes no notice of it. Therefore by this rule we are to interpret all the canons which forbid penitents to be ordained at first, or deny clergymen after penance the liberty of regaining their ancient station: they are to be understood of *public* penance, and not of private. And so this seeming difficulty and contradiction of the canons is easily adjusted, whilst the Council of Agde, which allows clergymen, reduced to the communion of strangers, liberty of resuming their office again after penance, must necessarily be interpreted of *private* penance, and not of public. And this makes it evident that this reducing of clergymen to the communion of strangers was only a temporary suspension of them from their office, and not a total degradation or reduction of them to the state and quality of laymen.

[95] C. 10. [al. 9.] (t. 4. p. 1569 a.) Is vero, qui ægritudinis languore depressus pœnitentiæ benedictionem, quam *viaticum* deputamus, per communionem acceperit, et postmodum reconvalescens caput pœnitentiæ in ecclesia publice non subdiderit; si prohibitis vitiis non detinetur obnoxius, admittatur ad clerum.

[96] De Eccles. Dogmat. c. 72. [al. 39.] (int. Oper. Augustin. t. 8. append. p. 79 d.) Clericum non ordinandum, qui publica pœnitentia mortalia crimina deflet.—C. Tolet. 1. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 1223 e.).... Pœnitente vero dicimus de eo, qui, ... publicam pœnitentiam gerens sub cilicio, divino fuerit reconciliatus altario.

CHAP. IV.

Of some other special and peculiar ways of inflicting punishment on the clergy.

Sometimes the clergy perpetually suspended from their office, yet allowed to retain their title and dignity.

1. Besides these more general and usual ways of punishing the offending clergy, there were also some less noted and uncommon ways of censuring them, which it will not be amiss to observe whilst we are upon this subject. Among these we may reckon that sort of suspension which deprived them entirely of the exercise of their office, and yet allowed them to retain their title and dignity. This was a sort of middle way between a temporary suspension and a perpetual degradation: for they were still allowed to communicate among the clergy, and not entirely reduced to the communion of laymen. Thus in the Council of Ancyra[1], 'those presbyters who had sacrificed to idols, but afterwards returned, and became confessors, were allowed to keep their dignity and title of presbyters, and sit among the rest in the presbytery; but not to preach, or offer the eucharist, or perform any other office of the sacred function.' The same is decreed[2] concerning deacons lapsing into idolatry, 'that they might retain their honour, but cease from all administration of the sacred office, neither distribute the bread nor the cup, nor minister as the common *præcones*, or *criers* of the Church, unless the bishop, in consideration of their great pains, humility, or meekness, thought fit to allow them more or less of their office, which was left entirely to his discretion.' The Council of Nice made a like decree[3] concerning the Novatian bishops, whom they degraded to the

[1] C. 1. (t. 1. p. 1456 c.) Πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐπιθύσαντας, εἶτα ἐπαναπαλαίσαντας, μήτε ἐκ μεθόδου τινὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀληθείας, μήτε προκατασκευάσαντας καὶ ἐπιτηδεύσαντας καὶ πείσαντας, ἵνα δόξωσι μὲν βασάνοις ὑποβάλλεσθαι, ταύτας δὲ τῷ δοκεῖν καὶ τῷ σχήματι προσαχθῆναι· τούτους ἔδοξε τῆς μὲν τιμῆς τῆς κατὰ τὴν καθέδραν μετέχειν, προσφέρειν δὲ αὐτοὺς, ἢ ὁμιλεῖν, ἢ ὅλως λειτουργεῖν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν λειτουργιῶν, μὴ ἐξεῖναι.

[2] C. 2. (ibid. d.) Διακόνους ὁμοίως θύσαντας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀναπαλαίσαντας, τὴν μὲν ἄλλην τιμὴν ἔχειν, πεπαῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν, ἢ κηρύσσειν· εἰ μέν τοι τινὲς τῶν ἐπισκόπων τούτοις συνείδοιεν κάματόν τινα ἢ ταπείνωσιν πραότητος, καὶ ἐθέλοιεν πλείόν τι διδόναι ἢ ἀφαιρεῖν, ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

[3] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 33 b.) Ὁ δὲ ὀνομαζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις Καθαροῖς ἐπίσκοπος, τὴν τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τιμὴν ἕξει· πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα δοκοίη τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν μετέχειν.

order of presbyters, but yet permitted them to retain the title of bishops, if the bishop of the place thought fit to allow it. And the same was determined in the case of Miletius by the same Synod[4], 'that he might retain the bare name and honour of a bishop, but never after officiate in his own church, or any other.' So in the Canons of St. Basil[5], a delinquent presbyter is allowed 'to sit among the rest,' but obliged 'to abstain from all offices belonging to his order.' And an offending deacon[6] is 'suspended from his ministry, but yet allowed to partake of the holy elements among the other deacons.' The Council of Agde has a like decree[7] about presbyters and deacons, who were digamists, or had married the relict of some other man; 'that though some former rules of the fathers had ordered them to be more severely handled, yet such respect and tenderness should be shown to those who were already ordained, that they might retain the name of presbyters and deacons: but the presbyters should neither presume to consecrate, nor the deacons to minister in the church.' A like determination was made by the general Council of Ephesus[8], in the case of one Eustathius, metropolitan of Pamphylia, who for the love of a private life, and some troubles that he met with in his office, voluntarily relinquished and deserted his bishopric

[4] Ep. Synod. ap. Theodor. l. 1. c. 9. (v. 3. p. 32. 11.) *Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν ἀκριβῆ λόγον, οὐδὲ μιᾶς συγγνώμης ἄξιος ἦν· μένειν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν, μήτε προσχειρίζεσθαι, μήτε χειροθετεῖν, μήτε ἐν χώρᾳ ἢ πόλει τινὶ φαίνεσθαι ταύτης τῆς προθέσεως ἕνεκεν, ψιλὸν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς τιμῆς κεκτῆσθαι.*—Socrat. l. 1. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 27. 20.) where the same words occur.—Sozom. l. 1. c. 24. (ibid. p. 42. 4.) *Ἐξετασθέντων δὲ καὶ τῶν κατὰ Μελίτιον ἀνὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον συμβάντων, κατεδίκασεν αὐτὸν ἡ σύνοδος ἐν τῇ Λυκῷ διατρίβειν, ψιλὸν ὄνομα ἐπισκοπῆς ἔχοντα· τοῦ δὲ λοιποῦ, μήτε ἐν πόλει μήτε ἐν κώμῃ χειροτονεῖν.*

[5] C. 27. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 199. Canonic. Secund.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1737 d.) *Περὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τοῦ κατ' ἄγνοιαν ἀθέσμῳ γάμῳ περιπαρέντος ὥρισα ἃ ἐχρῆν· καθέδρας μὲν μετέχειν, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἀπέχεσθαι.*

[6] C. 70. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 217. Canonic. Tert.] (CC. ibid. p. 1752 c.) *Διάκονος ἐν χείλεσι μιανθεὶς, καὶ μέχρι τούτου ἡμαρτηκέναι ὁμολογήσας, τῆς λειτουργίας ἐπισχεσθήσεται.*

[7] C. 1. (t. 4. p. 1383 a.) Placuit de digamis, aut internuptarum maritis, quanquam aliud patrum statuta decreverint, ut qui huc usque ordinati sunt, habita miseratione, presbyteri vel diaconi nomen tantum obtineant: officium vero consecrandi presbyteri, et ministrandi hujusmodi diacones, non præsumant.

[8] Ep. Synod. ad Synod. Pamphyl. (t. 3. p. 807 d.) .... *Ἐδικαιώσαμεν καὶ ὡρίσαμεν δίχα πάσης ἀντιλογίας ἔχειν αὐτὸν τό τε τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ὄνομα, καὶ τὴν τιμὴν, καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν. Οὕτω μέντοι, ὥστε μὴ χειροτονεῖν αὐτὸν, μήτε μὴν ἐκκλησίαν καταλαβόντα ἱερουργεῖν ἐξ ἰδίας αὐθεντείας· ἀλλ' ἢ ἄρα συμπαραλαμβανόμενον, εἴτουν ἐπιτρεπόμενον, εἰ τύχοι, παρὰ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συνεπισκόπου, κατὰ διάθεσιν καὶ ἀγάπην τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ.*

against canon, but afterward petitioned the Council that he might enjoy the name and honour of a bishop still: in which respect the Council gratified him, out of regard to his age and quiet temper; allowing him to have both the name, and honour, and communion of a bishop, but with this condition, 'that he should neither ordain, nor take any church to officiate in as a priest by his own authority, unless he was admitted as a coadjutor, or expressly allowed by the bishop of the place.'

Sometimes degraded, not totally, but partially, from one order to another.

2. It appears from one of the forementioned canons[9] that there was such a punishment also as a partial degradation; which was when the clergy were not totally deprived of all clerical degree and office, but only thrust down from an higher order to a lower, by way of discipline and correction. Thus the Council of Nice treated the Novatian schismatics, admitting those who had passed for bishops among them to officiate only as presbyters in the Catholic Church, unless any bishops would promote them to the office of a *chorepiscopus* under their jurisdiction. And so the Council of Neocæsarea[10] orders 'deacons that sin to be thrust down and degraded to the order of subdeacons.' And by this rule it was, as Valesius[11] observes, out of St. Jerom's Chronicon, that Cyril of Jerusalem degraded Heraclius from the order of a bishop to that of a presbyter. But the Council of Chalcedon seems not to have approved of this rule: for in one of her canons[12] it is said 'to be sacrilege to bring down a bishop to the degree of a presbyter: and that therefore, if there be any just cause to remove a bishop

[9] C. Nicæn. c. 8. See n. 3, preceding.

[10] C. 10. (t. 1. p. 1484 a.) *Ὁμοίως καὶ διάκονος, ἐὰν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ἁμαρτήματι περιπέσῃ, τὴν τοῦ ὑπηρέτου τάξιν ἐχέτω.*—Vid. C. Tolet. 1. c. 4. (t. 2. p. 1224 a.) Subdiaconus autem, defuncta uxore, si aliam duxerit, ab officio, in quo ordinatus fuerat, removeatur, et habeatur inter ostiarios, vel inter lectores, ita ut Evangelium et Apostolum [al. Epistolam] non legat.—C. Trull. c. 20. (t. 6. p. 1154 d.) *Μὴ ἐξέστω ἐπισκόπῳ εἰς ἑτέραν τὴν μὴ αὐτῷ προσήκουσαν πόλιν δημοσίᾳ διδάσκειν· εἰ δέ τις φωραθείη τοῦτο ποιῶν, τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς πανέσθω, τὰ δὲ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ἐνεργείτω.*

[11] In Sozom. l. 4. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 176. n. 5.) *Ἡράκλειος.* Hunc Heraclium Maximus moriens sibi successorem designaverat. Verum Cyrillus, Arianorum factione ad episcopatum promotus, eum, variis fraudibus appetitum, ex episcopo in presbyteri locum regradavit, ut scribit Hieronymus in Chronico.

[12] C. 29. (t. 4. p. 770 d.) *Ἐπίσκοπον εἰς πρεσβυτέρου βαθμὸν φέρειν, ἱεροσυλία ἐστίν· εἰ δὲ αἰτία τις δικαία ἐκείνους ἀπὸ τῆς πράξεως τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποκινεῖ, οὐδὲ πρεσβυτέρου τόπον κατέχειν ὀφείλουσιν.*

from the exercise of his episcopal function, he ought not to hold the place of a presbyter either.' By which we may conclude, that this point of discipline varied according to the different apprehensions and sentiments of men in different ages.

Sometimes deprived of a part of their office, but allowed to exercise the rest.

3. Sometimes again they were deprived of their office, as to some particular act of it, but allowed to exercise the rest. Thus the Council of Neocæsarea orders[13], 'that if any presbyter confessed that he had been guilty of any corporal uncleanness before his ordination, he should not consecrate the eucharist, but might continue in the exercise of all other parts of his office, if he was a man diligent in his function.' And in the fourth Council of Carthage it was decreed[14], 'that if a bishop ordained any one wittingly who had done public penance, the ordination of which was prohibited by the canons, he should for his transgression be deprived of his episcopal power, as to what concerned the particular act of ordaining only:' which implies, that he was still allowed to exercise all other parts of his office and function.

Sometimes deprived of their power over a part of their flock, but allowed it over the rest.

4. In Afric we sometimes find bishops for their mal-administration and indiscreet government deprived of their power over some part of their flock, and yet allowed still to govern the rest. This may be collected from St. Austin's account of their proceeding with one Antonius[15], a young bishop, who had oppressed some of his people at Fussala by unreasonable exactions; for which it was thought fit to punish him with this gentle correction, that he should no longer rule over that part

[13] C. 9. (t. 1. p. 1481 e.) Πρεσβύτερος, ἐὰν προημαρτηκὼς σώματι προαχθῇ, καὶ ὁμολογήσῃ, ὅτι ἥμαρτε πρὸ τῆς χειροτονίας, μὴ προσφερέτω, μένων ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς, διὰ τὴν ἄλλην σπουδήν.

[14] C. 68. (t. 2. p. 1205 c.) Si autem sciens episcopus ordinaverit talem, etiam ipse ab episcopatus sui, ordinandi duntaxat, potestate privetur. —Vid. C. Taurin. c. 2. (ibid. p. 1156 b.) Certe ad pacis vinculum conservandum . . . decretum est, ut . . . unaquæque [urbs] de his viciniores sibi intra provinciam vindicet civitates.

[15] Ep. 261. [al. 209.] (t. 2. p. 778 c.) Denique sententias nostras sic temperavimus, ut, salvo episcopatu, non tamen omnino impunita relinquerentur, quæ non deberent vel eidem ipsi deinceps iterumque facienda, vel cæteris imitanda proponi. Honorem itaque integrum servavimus juveni corrigendo: sed corripiendo minuimus potestatem, ne scilicet eis præesset ulterius, cum quibus sic egerat; ut dolore justo eum sibi præesse ferre omnino non possent, et, cum suo illiusque periculo in aliquod scelus forsitan erupturam impatientiam sui doloris ostenderent.

of his people whom he had so oppressed, lest their grief and impatience should break out into some violent attempts, that might be dangerous to both parties. Antonius indeed complained of this as an infringement of his just rights and powers: for he pleaded that a bishop ought either to be deposed or to be left in the full exercise of his jurisdiction and power. But St. Austin shows that this was no new thing in Afric, nor unreasonable in itself: for a bishop may be guilty of many misdemeanours, for which it will neither be proper to let him go wholly unpunished, nor yet to use such severity as to deprive him universally of his episcopal honour and power. In such cases the middle way proves the most useful correction; neither to use too great severity above the nature of the offence, nor too much lenity and mildness to let it pass entirely without any censure or correction. And he shows that this was a method often taken in Afric for less faults in other instances of punishment.

Bishops in Afric punished by depriving them of their seniority and right of succeeding to the primacy or metropolitical power.

5. Particularly in Afric, (where the primacy of metropolitans always went by seniority of ordination, so that the oldest bishop always regularly succeeded to the primacy of course, whatever diocese he was possessed of,) it was customary to punish an offending bishop with the loss of his seniority and right to the primacy, by rendering him incapable of ever attaining it. This we learn from St. Austin in the same Epistle[16], where he gives an instance in one Priscus, of the province of Mauritania Cæsariensis, who was thus censured: and if Antonius's argument had been good, Priscus might have pleaded the same, that he ought either to have been allowed his right of succeeding to the primacy, or to have been deprived of his bishopric: but the African discipline took the middle way for certain crimes, neither to deprive bishops of their episcopal power, nor to let them go wholly unpunished.

Also by confining them to the communion of their own church.

6. Another instance of this discipline was to confine an offending bishop to the communion of his own church, and prohibit all other bishops from admitting him to communion in any of their churches. St. Austin mentions one Victor[17], who

[16] Ibid. (p. 779 b.) Clamet Priscus, provinciæ Cæsariensis episcopus, Aut ad primatum locus sicut cæteris et mihi patere debuit, aut episcopatus mihi remanere non debuit.

[17] Ibid. (c.) Clamet alius, ejusdem provinciæ Victor episcopus, cui

was thus censured; and he might have pleaded after the same manner, 'Either I ought to communicate in all churches, or not communicate in my own.' But this was thought a reasonable way of discountenancing an offending bishop for some smaller faults, when they did not think them worthy of the highest censure: as in case a bishop neglected to come to the provincial synod at the primate's call, or ordained another man's clerk without his license or approbation; which are some of the offences specified in the African Synods[18], for which a bishop might incur this censure.

Or removing them from a greater diocese to a less.

7. St. Austin gives a third instance of this discipline in the African Church: which was the removing of a negligent bishop from a greater diocese to a less; which was a kind of tacit reproach and dishonour to him, and the disgrace was his punishment. For as it was an honour for a bishop to be translated from a less diocese to a greater by the approbation and judgment of a venerable synod, without which they might not move: so it was a dishonour and reproach to him to be thrust down by a synodical decree, though not to a lower order, yet to a lower station. The one was an argument of merit and great worth, and the other an argument of some demerit and misdemeanour; and therefore the one was used by way of reward, to promote a bishop for his abilities and good service; and the other by way of punishment, to give a negligent bishop a little gentle admonition and moderate correction. And thus St. Austin[19] tells us one Laurentius, a bishop, was punished by the discipline of the African Church.

relicto in eadem pœna, in qua et Priscus fuit, nusquam nisi in diœcesi ejus ab alio communicatur episcopo; clamet, inquam, Aut ubique communicare debui, aut etiam in meis locis communicare non debui.

[18] Vid. C. Carth. 5. c. 10. (t. 2. p. 1217 a.) Placuit, ut quotiescumque congregandum est concilium, episcopi, qui neque ætate, neque ægritudine, neque alia graviori necessitate impediuntur, competenter occurrant.... Quod si non potuerint occurrere, excusationes suas in tractatoria subscribant: vel si post adventum tractatoriæ aliquæ necessitates repente forsitan fuerint, nisi rationem impedimenti sui apud suum primatem reddiderint, ab ecclesiæ suæ communione debere esse contemptos [al. contentos].—C. 13. (ibid. e.) Placuit, ut si quis de alterius monasterio repertum, vel ad clericatum promovere voluerit, vel in suo monasterio majorem monasterii constituere; episcopus, qui hoc fecerit, a cæterorum communione sejunctus, suæ tantum plebis communione contentus sit: et ille neque clericus, neque præpositus perseveret.—See also Cod. African. cc. 77 and 81. [al. 76 and 80.] (ibid. p. 1095 b. p. 1098 a.) where the same terms occur in Greek.

[19] Ubi supr. (t. 2. p. 779 c.) Clamet tertius, ejusdem provinciæ Lau-

8. It was a moderate punishment, much of the same nature, which the Council of Trullo[20] mentions as common to all orders of the clergy in general; which was to deprive them of their seniority, and sink them down to the lowest seat or degree among those of the same order. This was commonly the punishment of persons of an ambitious and assuming temper. The Council instances in such deacons as, because they had some more honourable ecclesiastical office, would presume to take place of the presbyters, and sit before them; against whom they allege the parable of our Saviour, "When thou art bidden to a wedding, sit not down in the most honourable place, &c... .... For he that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted." [Luk. 14, 8—11.]

The clergy in general punished by loss of their seniority among those of the same order.

The author of the Apostolical Constitutions[21] takes notice of the same punishment, as used in his time, even among the laity also. For 'if an honourable person came into the assembly, being a stranger, and any one refused upon the deacon's admonition to give him place to sit down; he that so refused was to be removed by compulsion beneath the lowest rank of hearers in the church.' Cotelerius[22] notes the same order as ob-

rentius episcopus, et prorsus hujus vocibus clamet, Aut in cathedra, cui ordinatus sum, sedere debui, aut episcopus esse non debui.

[20] C. 7. (t. 6. p. 1143 e.) *Ἐπειδὴ μεμαθήκαμεν, ἔν τισι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν διακόνους τυγχάνειν ὀφφίκια ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἔχοντας, ἐντεῦθέν τινας αὐτῶν αὐθαδείᾳ καὶ αὐτονομίᾳ κεχρημένους πρὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καθέζεσθαι· ὁρίζομεν ὥστε τὸν διάκονον, κἂν ἐν ἀξιώματι, τουτέστιν, ὀφφικίῳ οἱῳδήποτε ἐκκλησιαστικῷ τυγχάνῃ, τὸν τοιοῦτον μὴ πρὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου καθέζεσθαι, ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ τὸ πρόσωπον ἐπέχων τοῦ οἰκείου πατριάρχου ἢ μητροπολίτου ἐν ἑτέρᾳ πόλει παραγένηται ἐπί τινι κεφαλαίῳ· τότε γὰρ ὡς τὸν ἐκείνου τόπον ἀναπληρῶν τιμηθήσεται. Εἰ δέ τις τοιοῦτον τολμήσει, τυραννικῷ χρώμενος θράσει, διαπράξασθαι, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐκ τοῦ οἰκείου καταβιβασθεὶς βαθμοῦ ἔσχατος πάντων γινέσθω τοῦ ἐν ᾧπερ καταλέγεται τάγματος ἐν τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ, τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν παραινοῦντος, Μὴ χαίρειν ταῖς πρωτοκλισίαις, κατὰ τὴν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ εὐαγγελιστῇ Λουκᾷ, ὡς ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ Θεοῦ κειμένην διδασκαλίαν· ἔλεγε γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολὴν ἐπάγων, ... Ἐὰν κληθῇς, κ. τ. λ.*

[21] L. 2. c. 58. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 267.) ... *Ἐκεῖνον* [scil. *ἔνδοξον*] *καθισάτω· δίκαιον δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸν φιλάδελφον ποιῆσαι· ἐὰν δὲ ἀνανεύῃ, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν ἀναγκαστῶς ὀπίσω πάντων στῆσον.*

[22] [Cotel. in loc. (ibid. n. 51.) In Regula S. Pachomii, articulo 85. *Si quis iracundus et furiosus frequenter irascatur sine causa et propter rem inanem et vacuam; per sex vices commonebitur, et in septima facient eum surgere de ordine sessionis suæ et inter ultimos collocabitur.* Et in Regula S. Benedicti, c. 43. *Quod si quis ad nocturnas vigilias post gloriam psalm. 94. (quem propter hoc omnino protrahendo et morose volumus dici) occurrerit, non stet in ordine suo in choro, sed omnium ultimus stet, aut in loco, quem talibus negligentibus seorsum constituerit ab-*

served among the monks in the rules of Pachomius and St. Benedict for smaller offences. And in the second Council of Nice[23], a like rule was made for the correction of the clergy, 'that if any one through haughtiness insulted another, he should for his offence be thrust down to the lowest degree of his own order, to teach him humility and submission in his station.'

And rendering them incapable of being promoted to any higher order.

9. They had also a negative punishment of the same nature for all the inferior orders of the clergy, which was, to deny them all further promotion, and incapacitate them from attaining to any higher order in the Church.

The first Council of Toledo has several canons to this purpose. The first canon[24] orders, 'that deacons, who lived incontinently with their wives, should never arrive to the honour of presbytery, nor presbyters to episcopacy.' This was one of the first steps made towards settling the celibacy of the clergy, which at first was introduced, not by disannulling the orders of the married clergy, but by debarring them from being advanced to any higher order. Another canon[25] appoints, 'that if a reader marries a widow, he shall never be promoted to any higher degree, but always continue a reader, or at most a subdeacon.' And a third canon[26] of the same Council decrees, 'that if any one after baptism had followed the soldier's life, though he had never happened to shed blood, if he were ordained to any of the inferior orders, he should never arrive to

bas, &c. Cujus posterioris præcepti vestigia premit caput 131. libri 1. Synodi Aquisgranensis anno 816 congregatæ. Nec multum dissimilis est alia censura Concilii Trullani can. 7., et Concilii Nicæni II. can. 5., per quam clericus ad ultimum gradum ordinis sui amandatur, fitque sociorum omnium *ὑποβάθμιος. Grischov.*]

[23] C. 5. (t. 7. p. 600 c.) *Τοὺς ἀναιδεῖ προσώπῳ καὶ ἀπερικαλύπτῳ στόματι ὀνειδιστικοῖς λόγοις τοὺς δι' ἀρετὴν βίου ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκλεγέντας καὶ καταγέντας ἐκτὸς δόσεως χρυσίου ἀτιμάζοντας· πρῶτον μὲν, τοῦτο ποιοῦντας τὸν ἔσχατον βαθμὸν λαμβάνειν τοῦ οἰκείου τάγματος· εἰ δὲ ἐπιμένοιεν, δι' ἐπιτιμίου διορθούσθωσαν.*

[24] C. 1. (t. 2. p. 1223 d.) Placuit ut diacones,.. qui incontinenter cum uxoribus vixerint, presbyterii honore non cumulentur. Si quis vero ex presbyteris ante interdictum filios [suos] susceperit, de presbyterio ad episcopatum non admittatur [al. permittatur].

[25] C. 3. (ibid. p. 1224 a.) Lector, si viduam alterius uxorem acceperit, amplius nihil sit, sed semper lector habeatur, aut forte subdiaconus.

[26] C. 8. (ibid. e.) Si quis post baptismum militaverit, et chlamydem sumpserit aut cingulum, etiamsi gravia non admiserit, si ad clerum admissus fuerit, diaconii non accipiat dignitatem. [*Aut cingulum ad necandos fideles,* the marginal reading in Labbe, qualifies the sense. Ed.]

the dignity of a deacon in the Church.' A like decree was made in the Council of Lerida[27], 'that if any clergyman, who ministered at the altar, shed human blood, though it were the blood of an enemy in the straitness of a siege, he should not only be suspended from his office and communion for two years, but after he was restored to his office and communion again, should remain incapable of being advanced to any higher office in the Church.' And there is another canon in the same Council[28], which orders 'such clergymen as fall by the frailty of the flesh, after penance, to be received again; yet so as not to expect any further promotion in the Church.' The first Council of Orange[29], and the Council of Turin[30], have canons to the same purpose: and Pope Leo[31] delivers it as a rule, founded upon the general practice of the Church, in the case of heretical clergymen returning to the unity of the faith, 'that they were to take it as a favour, if they were allowed to continue in the order they were in before, though deprived of all hopes of further advancement.'

Among the Greeks, St. Basil has a like rule[32] concerning readers, who were guilty of ante-nuptial fornication, 'that every such delinquent should be suspended a year from his office, *μένων ἀπρόκοπος, remaining moreover for ever incapable*

[27] C. 1. (t. 4. p. 1611 a.) De his clericis, qui in obsessionis necessitate positi fuerint, id statutum est, ut, qui altario ministrant, et Christi sanguinem [al. corpus et sanguinem] tradunt, vel vasa sacro officio deputata contrectant, ut ab omni humano sanguine etiam hostili abstineant. Quod si in hoc inciderint, duobus annis, tam officio quam communione priventur: ita ut his duobus annis, vigiliis, jejuniis, orationibus, et eleemosynis, pro viribus quas Dominus donaverit, expientur, et ita demum officio, vel communioni reddantur; ea tamen ratione servata, ne ulterius ad officia potiora promoveantur.

[28] C. 5. (ibid. p. 1612 a.) Hi, qui altario Dei deserviunt, si subito in flenda carnis fragilitate corruerint, et Domino respiciente digne pœnituerint, ita ut mortificato corpore cordis contriti sacrificium Deo offerant, maneat in potestate pontificis, vel veraciter afflictos non diu suspendere, vel desidiosos prolixiore tempore ab ecclesiæ corpore segregare; ita tamen, ut sic officiorum suorum loca recipiant, ne possint ad altiora officia ulterius promoveri.

[29] C. 24. (t. 3. p. 1450 e.) De his autem, qui prius ordinati hoc ipsum inciderunt, Taurinatis synodi sequendam esse sententiam, qua jubentur non ulterius promoveri.

[30] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 1157 d.) Hi autem, qui contra interdictum sunt ordinati, vel in ministerio filios genuerunt, ne ad majores gradus ordinum permittantur, synodi decrevit auctoritas.

[31] Ep. 3. ad Julianum. al. Januarium. (t. 3. p. 1296 d.) Circa quos etiam eam canonum constitutionem præcipimus custodiri, ut in magno habeant beneficio, si, adempta sibi omni spe promotionis, in quo inveniuntur ordine stabilitate perpetua maneant, si tamen iterata tinctione non fuerint maculati.

[32] C. 69. See before, ch. 1. s. 5. p. 7, the second part of n. 18.

of attaining to any higher station or preferment in the Church. And Justinian, in one of his Novels[33], made a parallel decree concerning readers, 'that if any of them married a second wife, or a widow, or one divorced from a former husband, or otherwise forbidden by the laws or sacred canons; that he should never be advanced to any other ecclesiastical order: or if by any means he happened to be unwarily so advanced, he should be put down again, and reduced to his former order.' This was one of those negative punishments which may be proper to discourage and correct offences of a lesser kind; and so far as it was serviceable to that end, it may be reckoned an useful part of the discipline of the Church.

The clergy sometimes punished by denying them the public exercise of their office, whilst they were allowed to officiate in private.

10. St. Basil[34] mentions another piece of discipline, which was pretty peculiar; for I remember no other writer at present that mentions it beside himself; that was, to deny an offending clergyman the liberty of exercising his office in public, whilst he was allowed to officiate in private. This was a rule made by St. Basil in the case of Bianor and some other presbyters of Antioch in Pisidia, who, upon some injury done them, had rashly sworn they would never execute the office of presbyters any more: but afterward, repenting of their rash oath, were willing to be admitted to the exercise of their office again. St. Basil, being consulted in the case, determined that they ought to be restrained from the public exercise of their function, because of the scandal and offence that might be given to many thereby; but still they might be allowed to officiate in private, where no such offence could be taken.

These are the specialities of those punishments, which the discipline of the Church commonly inflicted on clergymen for lesser offences; which I have the rather mentioned, because they are seldom to be met with in the accounts of church-discipline, given by modern writers.

[33] Novel. 123. c. 14. (t. 5. p. 547.) Si vero lector secundam ducat uxorem, aut primam quidem viduam, aut separatam a viro, aut legibus vel sacris canonibus interdictam, nequaquam ad alium ecclesiasticum ordinem provehatur: sed etsi ad majorem ordinem perducatur, expellatur eo, et priori restituatur.

[34] C. 17. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 199. Canonic. Secund.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1732 b.) *Ἠρώτησας ἡμᾶς περὶ Βιάνορος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, εἰ δεκτός ἐστιν εἰς κὸν κλῆρον, διὰ τὸν ὅρκον; Ἐγὼ δὲ ἤδη τινὰ καὶ κοινὸν ὅρον περὶ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ ὁμωμοκότων, τοῖς κατ' Ἀντιόχειαν κληρικοῖς, οἶδα ἐκτεθεικώς· ὥστε τῶν μὲν δημοσίων αὐτοὺς ἀπέχεσθαι συλλόγων, ἰδίᾳ δὲ ἐνεργεῖν τὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.*

11. To all these we may add, that in the fourth and fifth ages, when monasteries began to be settled in the world, nothing was more common than to confine an offending clerk to some monastery, either for a certain term, or during his whole life, as the nature of his temporary suspension or his perpetual deprivation required, there to exercise himself in acts of private repentance for his offences. This was a convenience rather than a punishment, giving them an opportunity of qualifying themselves the better either for a restoration to their office, or for their reception into lay-communion; and therefore it was indifferently used both in cases of deprivation and suspension. Many, who were only suspended from the exercise of their office for a certain time, were yet confined to a monastery during that term; as appears from one of Justinian's Novels[35], where it is ordered, 'that if a presbyter or a deacon was convicted of giving false evidence in a pecuniary cause, they should be suspended from their ministry for three years, and be confined to a monastery during the time of their suspension.' And this was in lieu of scourging, which was inflicted for this crime upon other offenders. The second Council of Seville decrees the same[36] in the case of a clergyman, who deserts his own church without his bishop's leave, and makes his residence in any other: 'he is to lose the badge of his honour and ordination for some time, and be bound to a monastery, till it be proper to recall him to the ministry of his ecclesiastical order again.' But in case the punishment amounted to a total and perpetual deprivation, then they were frequently sent to a monastery for their whole lives, and there they spent the remainder of their days only in lay-communion. Of which the canons of Agde[37] and Epone[38] are full proof, to which I refer the learned reader in the margin.

Of intrusion of offenders into a monastery to do penance in private.

[35] Novel. 123. c. 20. (t. 5. p. 550.) Sufficiat pro verberibus tribus annis separari a sacro ministerio, et monasteriis tradi.

[36] C. 3. (t. 5. p. 1664 e.) Desertorem autem clericum, cingulo honoris atque ordinationis suæ exutum, aliquo tempore monasterio relegari [al. deligari] convenit: sicque postea in ministerio ecclesiastici ordinis revocari.

[37] C. 1. (t. 4. p. 1391 e.) Si episcopus, presbyter, vel diaconus, capitale crimen commiserit, aut chartam falsaverit, aut testimonium falsum dixerit, ab officii honore depositus in monasterium [al. monasterio] retrudatur: et ibi, quamdiu vixerit, laicam tantummodo communionem accipiat.

[38] C. 22. (ibid. p. 1579 a.) Si diaconus aut presbyter crimen capitale commiserit, ab officii honore depositus in monasterium retrudatur,

f corporal
ishment. How
r used as
piece of
scipline
on the
ferior
ergy.

12. We may observe further, that in the same ages, when it was the custom to shut delinquents up in a monastery, some corporal punishment and confinement in prison also was used, as a piece of church-discipline, to correct the inferior orders. I have had occasion to show before[39], that the larger churches had commonly their *decanica* or *prisons* for this purpose; which were not any one distinct building, but some of the *catechumenia*, or *diaconica*, or *secretaria*, belonging to the church, and made use of for this end, to put offending clerks to a more decent confinement in them.

It has also been noted in another place[40], that all monasteries had the discipline of the whip or scourge among them, to punish the junior monks and unruly offenders. And it is as certain it was also used for the correction of the inferior orders among the clergy. The Council of Agde mentions it twice; first[41], as the punishment of those who wandered about from one church to another, without the recommendatory letters of their bishop; whom the canon orders first to be corrected by words, and then by stripes, if they remained incorrigible upon admonition. Another canon[42] appoints the same discipline for drunkenness: 'A clerk, who is convicted of being drunken, is either to be suspended thirty days from communion, or else to be chastised by corporal punishment.' The Council of Epone expressly distinguishes[43] between the superior and inferior clergy in the case: 'If one of the superior clergy feast with an heretic, he is to be suspended for a year; but one of the inferior for the same crime is to be beaten.' The first Council of Mascon orders[44], 'that if a clergyman be found wearing an indecent habit, or carrying arms, he shall be imprisoned thirty

ibi tantummodo quamdiu vixerit communionem sumendo [al. communione sumenda].

[39] B. 8. ch. 7. s. 9. v. 3. p. 128.

[40] B. 7. ch. 3. s. 12. v. 2. p. 371.

[41] C. 38. (ibid. p. 1389 d.) Clericis, sine commendatitiis epistolis episcopi sui, licentia non pateat evagandi;.... quos si verborum increpatio non emendaverit, etiam verberibus statuimus coerceri.

[42] C. 41. (ibid. p. 1390 c.)..... Quem [clericum] ebrium fuisse constiterit, ... aut triginta dierum spatio communione statuimus submovendum, aut corporali subdendum supplicio.

[43] C. 15. (ibid. p. 1578 a.) Si superioris loci clericus hæretici cujuscunque [clerici] convivio interfuerit, anni spatio pacem ecclesiæ non habebit; quod si minores [al. juniores] clerici præsumpserint, vapulabant.

[44] C. 3. [al. 5.] (t. 5. p. 968 b.) ... Clericus, si cum indecenti veste aut cum armis inventus fuerit, a seniore ita coerceatur, ut triginta dierum inclusione detentus aqua tantum et modico pane diebus singulis sustentetur.

days, and fed only with bread and water.' This imprisonment was the punishment of the superior clergy: for in another canon[44] the distinction is expressly made in the case of one clergyman accusing another before a secular magistrate: 'If he were one of the superior clergy, he was to be imprisoned thirty days; if one of the inferior, to receive forty stripes save one.' And this was done in conformity to the rule in the Law of Moses[45], that they should not exceed forty stripes; only in case the crime was great, they might repeat them after some days: which is observed out of the Life of Cæsarius Arelatensis by the late French author of the *Historia Flagellantium*[46], who cites many other writers, which need not here be mentioned. I only add that of St. Austin[47], who says, 'this way of coercion was used in bishops' courts in his time;' but whether he means towards the clergy or the laity is not absolutely certain. It might be towards both perhaps in lesser criminal causes, that were of an ecclesiastical nature: for as to those criminal causes, which were of a civil nature, bishops had no power, especially in cases of blood; in which sort of judgments a bishop could not be concerned, without incurring himself the highest censures of the Church: but they might have liberty to chastise the inferior clergy with corporal correction. The law indeed in many cases exempted the superior clergy from corporal punishment: as if a presbyter or a deacon gave false testimony in a pecuniary cause, they might be suspended, and sent to a monastery for a time, but not be corporally punished as other men. In criminal causes it was otherwise: false testimony in such a case deprived them of their orders, and reduced them to the state of laymen; and then, as other laymen, they were liable to corporal punishment, according as the laws required. But whether it were a pecuniary cause, or a criminal cause, if one of the inferior orders gave false testimony, in either case he was liable to suffer corporal punishment: and in this consisted the difference between the superior

[44] C. 5. [al. 8.] (ibid. d.) Si junior fuerit, uno minus de quadraginta ictus accipiat; si certe honoratior triginta dierum inclusione [al. conclusione] mulctetur.

[45] [Deut. 25, 3. Forty stripes he may give him and not exceed, &c.— See also 2 Cor. 11, 24. Ed.]

[46] Paris. 1700. 8vo. cc. 5, 6.

[47] Ep. 159. [al. 133.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 396 e.) Qui modus coercitionis [scil. per virgarum verbera] .... sæpe etiam in judiciis solet ab episcopis adhiberi.

and inferior clergy in this part of discipline, as is noted in one of Justinian's Novels[48], which helps to explain the practice of the Church.

And this is what I had to observe concerning those punishments, which by the rules of the ancient discipline were peculiarly inflicted on the clergy for the correction of their offences.

CHAP. V.

A particular account of the crimes for which clergymen were liable to be punished with any of the forementioned kinds of censure.

All crimes, that were punished with excommunication in a layman, punished with suspension or deposition in the clergy.

1. It remains that we now give a particular account of those crimes, for which clergymen might be punished. And here we must observe, that their crimes were of two sorts: such as were common to them with laymen, and such as they might be guilty of by transgressing the rules particularly relating to their office and function.

Of the former sort I need not discourse particularly here, because I have done it largely in the last Book, where I examined the nature of the several great crimes for which a layman might incur the censure of excommunication: there being only this general difference to be observed between the crimes of a laic and an ecclesiastic, that what was commonly punished with excommunication in a layman, was ordinarily punished with suspension or deposition in a clergyman; or, if the crime was very scandalous and flagrant, with excommunication also. For this reason I here pass over the great crimes of idolatry, divination, magic, sorcery, and enchantment, apostasy, heresy, schism, sacrilege, and simony; which are crimes against the First and Second Commandment in the Decalogue: as also blasphemy, profane swearing, perjury,

[48] Novel. 23. c. 20. (t. 5. p. 550.) Reverendissimis autem presbyteris, aut diaconis, etiamsi inventi fuerint pro pecuniaria causa falsum perhibuisse testimonium; sufficiat pro verberibus tribus annis separari a sacro ministerio, et monasteriis tradi. Pro criminalibus autem causis, si falsum testimonium dixerint, clero nudatos legitimis subdi pœnis præcipimus: reliquos autem omnes, in aliis etiam ecclesiasticis ordinibus constitutos, si falsum testimonium cujuslibet causæ, sive pecuniariæ, sive criminalis, dixisse convincantur, non solum ecclesiastico officio repelli, sed etiam verberibus subdi.

and breach of vows, against the Third Commandment: all violations of the law enjoining the religious observation of the Lord's-day, against the Fourth Commandment: all disobedience and disrespect to parents, and treason and rebellion against princes, and general contempt of the laws of the Church, infringing the obligations of the Fifth Commandment: all the species of murder against the Sixth Commandment, and all species of uncleanness and intemperance against the Seventh: all kinds of theft, fraud, oppression, and injustice against the Eighth, and all kinds of false testimony, libelling, informing, calumny and slander, against the Ninth Commandment: because I have already spoken of all these in particular, [throughout the chapters of the sixteenth Book,] and shown, that as they were punished with excommunication in the laity, so they were commonly punished with suspension or deprivation, and sometimes with excommunication in the clergy also.

But besides these crimes, common both to laity and clergy, there were many transgressions and offences that might be committed by the clergy against the particular rules of their function and profession: and of these we are here to make a more special inquiry. Some of these respected their entrance upon their office; others, their behaviour in it. We will now speak particularly, but briefly and succinctly, of both.

Some crimes rendered an ordination originally void, and for such the clergy were immediately liable to be degraded from their very first ordination. As, first, for ignorance or heterodoxy in religion.

2. Some qualifications were originally required in the clergy as necessary at their entrance upon the clerical life and function: and therefore certain rules were prescribed for a due examination and inquiry into these before their ordination; and a defect in any of these qualifications, or a transgression against any of these rules, was enough to render an ordination null and void *ab origine;* so that the clergy thus ordained were liable to be degraded or deposed immediately from their very first ordination. Of these qualifications, as I have had occasion to show more at large in a former Book [49], some respected their faith and knowledge, others their former life and morals, and others their outward quality and condition in the world: and a defect in any of these qualifications, or a transgression of any of the rules prescribed, was in the common course of the discipline of the Church a sufficient reason to depose a clergyman as soon as he was ordained.

[49] B. 4. ch. 3. v. 2. p. 34.

The first and principal qualification, so necessarily required, was an orthodox faith, and a competent knowledge in the Scriptures and all things relating to the exercise of his function: and, if a bishop was ordained either without such an examination, or without such qualifications, both the ordainer and the ordained were immediately to be deposed. The words of Justinian's law[48] are very express in this business: 'If any bishop is ordained contrary to the forementioned observation, we command, that both he who is so ordained be deposed, and also the bishop who so illegally ordained him.'

Secondly, for immorality and transgressing any of the known rules of ordination.

3. Another strict inquiry was to be made into men's morals; and if in any notorious instance they had formerly been culpable and scandalous, their ordination was forbidden; or if by ignorance or surreption they were ordained, they were immediately upon discovery and conviction, to be suspended, if not deposed. Thus in the Council of Neocæsarea we find a rule[49], 'that if a presbyter confessed that before his ordination he had been guilty of corporal uncleanness, he was no longer to be allowed to offer the sacrifice of the altar.' This sin always made a man irregular, though some were of opinion, as the canon intimates, that other sins were done away by ordination. The canons further required that a man should be no digamist, or twice married, nor married to a widow, nor to any that had been divorced from another man: and if any such were ordained, by the same rule of Justinian they were immediately liable to be deposed. It was forbidden likewise to ordain any man *ἀπολελυμένως*, that is, without fixing him to some particular diocese or church: and the ordination of any one con-

[48] Novel. 137. c. 2. (t. 5. p. 609.) Si quis autem præter memoratam observationem episcopus ordinetur, jubemus et ipsum omnibus modis episcopatu dejici, et eum qui contra talem observationem eum ordinare ausus fuerit.

[49] C. 9. (t. 1. p. 1481 e.) *Πρεσβύτερος, ἐὰν προημαρτηκὼς σώματι προαχθῇ, καὶ ὁμολογήσῃ, ὅτι ἥμαρτε πρὸ τῆς χειροτονίας, μὴ προσφερέτω, μένων ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς, διὰ τὴν ἄλλην σπουδήν. Τὰ γὰρ λοιπὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἔφασαν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ τὴν χειροθεσίαν ἀφιέναι, κ. τ. λ.*—Conf. C. Nicæn. c. 9. (t. 2. p. 33 b.) *Εἴ τινες ἀνεξετάστως προσήχθησαν πρεσβύτεροι, ἢ ἀνακρινόμενοι ὡμολόγησαν τὰ ἡμαρτημένα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ὁμολογησάντων αὐτῶν, παρὰ κανόνα κινουμένοι ἄνθρωποι τοῖς τοιούτοις χεῖρα ἐπιτεθείκασι· τούτους ὁ κανὼν οὐ προσίεται· τὸ γὰρ ἀνεπίληπτον ἐκδικεῖ ἡ Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.*—C. 10. (ibid. c.) *Ὅσοι προεχειρίσθησαν τῶν παραπεπτωκότων κατὰ ἄγνοιαν, ἢ καὶ προειδότων τῶν προχειρισαμένων, τοῦτο οὐ προκρίνει τῷ κανόνι τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ· γνωσθέντες γὰρ καθαιροῦνται.*—C. Eliber. c. 76. See before, ch. 2. s. 1. p. 16, the second part of n. 49.

trary to this rule, is by Pope Leo [50] pronounced vain; and by the great Council of Chalcedon [51] null and void.

It was another rule of this kind, for the preservation of good order in the Church, that no bishop should ordain another man's clerk without his consent: and if any one did so, the great Council of Nice [52], and the Council of Sardica [52], and the second of Arles [54], peremptorily pronounce all such ordinations null and void. It was required in the election and ordination of a bishop, that there should be the general consent of these four parties, the clergy, the people, the provincial bishops, and the metropolitan: and ordinations performed in derogation to any part of this rule are by abundance of canons declared absolutely void, and bishops so promoted are appointed to be deposed. The Council of Antioch [55] is express in requiring the presence or consent of the provincial bishops and metropolitan; decreeing, that an ordination performed contrary to this rule

[50] Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 1. (t. 3. p. 1405 e.).... Vana habenda est ordinatio, quæ nec loco fundata est nec auctoritate munita.

[51] C. 6. (t. 4. p. 758 e.) Μηδένα δὲ ἀπολελυμένως χειροτονεῖσθαι, μήτε πρεσβύτερον, μήτε διάκονον, μήτε ὅλως τινὰ τῶν ἐν ἐκκλησιαστικῷ τάγματι· εἰ μὴ ἰδικῶς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πόλεως, ἢ κώμης, ἢ μαρτυρίῳ, ἢ μοναστηρίῳ, ὁ χειροτονούμενος ἐπικηρύττοιτο. Τοὺς δὲ ἀπολύτως χειροτονουμένους ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἄκυρον ἔχειν τὴν τοιαύτην χειροθεσίαν, καὶ μηδαμοῦ δύνασθαι ἐνεργεῖν ἐφ' ὕβρει τοῦ χειροτονήσαντος.—See more of this b. 4. ch. 6. v. 2. p. 76.

[52] C. 16. (t. 2. p. 36 e.) Εἰ δὲ καὶ τολμήσειέ τις ὑφαρπάσαι τὸν τῷ ἑτέρῳ διαφέροντα, καὶ χειροτονῆσαι ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίᾳ, μὴ συγκατατιθεμένου τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, οὗ ἀνεχώρησεν ὁ ἐν τῷ κανόνι ἐξεταζόμενος, ἄκυρος ἔστω ἡ χειροτονία.

[53] C. 15. (ibid. p. 640 d.) Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ πάντες ὁρίσωμεν, ἵνα εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐξ ἑτέρας παροικίας βουληθῇ ἀλλότριον ὑπηρέτην, χωρὶς τῆς συγκαταθέσεως τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, εἴς τινα βαθμὸν καταστῆσαι, ἄκυρος καὶ ἀβέβαιος ἡ κατάστασις ἡ τοιαύτη νομίζοιτο.

[54] C. 13. (t. 4. p. 1012 e.) Nullus cujuscunque ordinis clericus, non diaconus, non presbyter, non episcopus, quacunque occasione faciente, propriam relinquat ecclesiam: sed omnimodis aut excommunicetur, aut redire cogatur. Quod si aliquo commorationis tempore, invito episcopo suo, in aliena ecclesia habitans, ab episcopo loci clericus fuerit ordinatus, hujusmodi ordinatio irrita habeatur.

[55] C. 19. (t. 2. p. 569 c.) Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι δίχα συνόδου καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας· τούτου δὲ παρόντος ἐξάπαντος βέλτιον μὲν συνεῖναι αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ συλλειτουργοὺς, καὶ προσήκει δι' ἐπιστολῆς τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει συγκαλεῖν, καὶ εἰ μὲν ἀπαντοῖεν οἱ πάντες, βέλτιον. Εἰ δὲ δυσχερὲς εἴη τοῦτο, τούς γε πλείους ἐξάπαντος παρεῖναι δεῖ, ἢ διὰ γραμμάτων ὁμοψήφους γενέσθαι· καὶ οὕτως, μετὰ τῆς τῶν πλειόνων ἤτοι παρουσίας ἢ ψήφου, γίνεσθαι τὴν κατάστασιν. Εἰ δὲ ἄλλως παρὰ τὰ ὡρισμένα γίγνοιτο, μηδὲν ἰσχύειν τὴν χειροτονίαν· εἰ δὲ κατὰ τὸν ὡρισμένον κανόνα γίγνοιτο ἡ κατάστασις, ἀντιλέγοιεν δέ τινες δι' οἰκείαν φιλονεικίαν, κρατεῖν τὴν τῶν πλειόνων ψῆφον.

shall be *of no force*,—μηδὲν ἰσχύειν. The Council of Riez[56] for this reason actually degraded Armentarius, bishop of Ambrun, because he had neither the general consent of the provincial bishops nor of the metropolitan, but was clancularly ordained by two bishops without the knowledge of the other parties chiefly concerned.

The canons, in the Latin Church especially, are altogether as peremptory and plain in disannulling all ordinations of bishops to any place against the general consent of the people. 'Let no bishop,' says one of the Councils of Orleans[57], 'be imposed upon a people against their wills. Nor let the clergy and people be constrained to give their consent by the oppression of any potent persons. If any such thing is done, the bishop, who is so ordained rather by violence than any legal decree, shall be deposed for ever from the honour of his priesthood.' In like manner the Council of Chalons[58]: 'A bishop shall not be chosen to any city any other way but by the consent of the provincial bishops, the clergy, and the people: if otherwise, the ordination shall be null and void.' To this agrees the resolution of Pope Leo[59], in answer to the queries of a French bishop, 'that reason will not allow those to be received as bishops, who were neither chosen by the clergy, nor desired by the people, nor consecrated by the provincial bishops with the judgment of the metropolitan.' And that rescript of Honorius[60] concerning the election of the bishop

[56] C. 1. [al. 2.] (t. 3. p. 1286 a.) .... Ordinationem, quam canones irritam definiunt, nos quoque evacuandam esse censuimus, in qua prætermissa trium præsentia, nec expetitis comprovincialium literis, metropolitani quoque voluntate neglecta, prorsus nihil, quod episcopum faceret, ostensum est.—Vid. C. Arelatens. 2. c. 6. (t. 4. p. 1012 a.) Illud autem ante omnia clareat eum, qui sine conscientia metropolitani constitutus fuerit episcopus, juxta magnam synodum esse episcopum non debere.—C. Aurelian. 5. c. 10. (t. 5. p. 393 d.) Ut nulli episcopatum præmiis aut comparatione liceat adipisci, &c.

[57] C. Aurelian. 5. c. 11. (ibid. e.) Nullus invitis detur episcopus, ... quod si factum fuerit, ipse episcopus, qui magis per violentiam quam per decretum legitimum ordinatur, ab indepto pontificatus honore in perpetuum deponatur.

[58] C. 10. (t. 6. p. 389 d.) Si quis episcopus de quacunque civitate fuerit defunctus, non ab alio nisi a comprovincialibus, clero et civibus suis, alterius habeatur electio: sin aliter, hujus ordinatio irrita habeatur.

[59] Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 1. (t. 3. p. 1405 d.) Nulla ratio sinit, ut inter episcopos habeantur, qui nec a clericis sunt electi, nec a plebibus expetiti, nec a provincialibus episcopis cum metropolitani judicio consecrati.

[60] Ad Bonifac. ap. Crabb. t. 1.

of Rome, 'that if two bishops were ordained by two contending parties, neither of them should be bishop, but one who was chosen out of the clergy by the judgment of the provincial bishops and the consent of all the people.' So that if any bishop was ordained against these rules, his ordination was void, and he was liable to be deposed as soon as he was ordained. So, if any bishop was ordained who was before under the sentence of deposition, his ordination was null, as was declared in the case of Timotheus Ælurus by several provincial Councils, related in the Acts[61] of the Council of Chalcedon. If a bishop was ordained into a full see, where another was regularly ordained before him, his ordination was of no effect, 'he was to be reputed as no bishop, but to be rejected as an adulterer, an intruder, an invader of other men's rights, and a wolf only in sheep's clothing:' which was the answer that Cyprian[62] gave in the case of Novatian; and the Council of Sardica in Hilary's Collection[63]; and the Oriental bishops

p. 491. (ap. Labb. t. 2. p. 1583 e.) Si duo contra fas temeritate certantes fuerint ordinati, nullum ex his futurum penitus sacerdotem; sed illum solum in sede apostolica permansurum, quem ex numero clericorum nova ordinatione divinum judicium et universitatis consensus elegerit.

[61] Synod. Cappadoc. in Act. C. Chalced. part. 3. (t. 4. p. 965 b.) Ea vero, quæ de Timotheo gesta sunt, penitus non laudamus: sacerdotium habere non potest. Primum quidem, quia oportet eum, qui ex quacunque causa deponitur, sustinere, et neque ad eum gradum accedere, neque ad majorem currere dignitatem, antequam is, qui eum deposuit, solvat sententiam in eo prolatam, aut certe sanctorum episcoporum synodus, quæ perspexerint justa, definiant. —— Synod. Galat. ibid. c. 57. (ibid. p. 970 c.) Eum, qui ex quacunque causa depositus est, non solum ad majorem gradum venire lex ecclesiastica non permittit, sed neque in ordine in quo fuit permanere, nisi deponens propria sententia eum rursus absolvat, aut certe synodus sanctorum episcoporum aliquid de eo disponat. —Synod. Paphlagon. c. 54. (ibid. p. 965 a.) De Timotheo vero, &c.—Synod. Corinth. c. 56. (ibid. p. 967 b.) Timotheum vero, &c.

[62] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 104. (p. 243.) Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi ejus judicio, de clericorum pene omnium testimonio, de plebis quæ tunc affuit suffragio, et de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio; cum nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est, cum locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret. Quo occupato de Dei voluntate, atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato, quisquis jam episcopus fieri voluerit, foris fiat necesse est; nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem, qui ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem: quisquis ille fuerit, multum de se licet jactans, et sibi plurimum vindicans; profanus est, alienus est, foris est.—Ibid. (p. 249.) Nisi si episcopus tibi videtur, qui, episcopo in ecclesia a sedecim coëpiscopis facto, adulter atque extraneus episcopus fieri a desertoribus per ambitum nititur, &c.

[63] De Synodis, p. 128. (Ed. Bened. Fragment. 2. n. 8. t. 2. pp. 628 a, seqq.).... Qui se ecclesiis immer-

and synods in the forementioned case of Timotheus Ælurus, mentioned both by Liberatus[64] and their own Acts[65] in the end of the Council of Chalcedon.

In like manner it was a rule in the Church, that no energumens, or persons possessed with an evil spirit, should be ordained; or if any such, by any chance or mistake, were ordained, he was immediately to be deposed. This is very expressly decreed in the first Council of Orange[66]: 'Energumens are not only not to be taken into any order of the clergy, but those who are already ordained, shall be removed from their office also.' 'There is a necessity of removing such demoniacs,' says Gelasius[67], 'lest such ministers should scandalize the weak, for whom Christ died.'

It was another rule of the Church[68], that no one who had voluntarily disfigured or dismembered his own body, should ever be admitted to any sacred order: and therefore if any such were actually ordained, by the order of the great Council of Nice[69] they were to cease from officiating; to be secluded from the clerical function as soon as discovered, according to the decree of Gelasius[70]; or, as the Roman Council[71] under

serunt luporum more, &c. ... Sint igitur vobis anathema, &c.

[64] Breviar. c. 15. (CC. t. 5. pp. 763 e, seqq.) Inthronizato autem eo, &c.

[65] Part. 3. Epp. 38, 39, 41. (t. 4. pp. 921 d, seqq.) Ubi plura de Timotheo.

[66] C. 16. (t. 3. p. 1450 b.) Energumeni [al. Qui palam aliquando arrepti sunt] non solum non assumendi sunt ad ullum ordinem clericatus, sed et illi, qui ordinati jam sunt, ab imposito officio sunt repellendi. [*Energumeni non, &c.*, is the reading of the older copies: Labbe's substitution of the words, *Qui palam, &c.*, changes the sense; for those terms must mean such persons *as had done public penance.* See the next section and n. 80, following. Ed.]

[67] Ep. 9. ad Episc. Lucaniæ, c. 19. (CC. t. 4. p. 1193 b.) Necessario removendi sunt, ne quibuslibet, pro quibus Christus est mortuus, scandalum generetur infirmis.

[68] Vid. C. Apost. 21. (Cotel. [c. 17.] v. 1. p. 440.) Ὁ ἑαυτὸν ἀκρωτηριάσας μὴ γινέσθω κληρικός· αὐτοφόντης [αὐτοφονευτὴς] γάρ ἐστιν [ἑαυτοῦ], καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δημιουργίας ἐχθρός.— C. Arelat. 2. c. 7. (t. 4. p. 1012 b.) Hos, qui se carnali vitio repugnare nescientes abscidunt, ad clerum pervenire non posse.

[69] C. 1. (t. 2. p. 29 a.)...Εἰ δέ τις ὑγιαίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐξέτεμε, τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ἐξεταζόμενον πεπαῦσθαι προσήκει· καὶ ἐκ τοῦ δεῦρο μηδένα τῶν τοιούτων χρῆναι προάγεσθαι.

[70] Ep. 9. c. 19. (CC. t. 4. p. 1193 c.) Si corpore sauciatum fortassis aut debilem nequaquam sancta contingere lex divina permittit; quanto magis doni cœlestis dispensatores esse non convenit, quod est deterius, mente perculsos?

[71] C. 3. (ibid. 1061 b.) Inscii quoque literarum, nec non et aliqua membrorum damna perpessi, et hi, qui ex pœnitentibus sunt, ad sacros ordines aspirare non audeant. Quis-

Hilary words it, 'If any such crept into orders, the bishop who consecrated them was obliged to nullify and dissolve his own act, as soon as the fraud was discovered.'

Another rule was, that no person who was unbaptized, or irregularly baptized without the due form of baptism, should be admitted to holy orders: and for this reason the Council of Nice [72] ordered all such as were ordained by the Paulianists to be both rebaptized and reordained, if they were otherwise found qualified for their function. A like order was made concerning all such as were baptized among heretics, or rebaptized by them, that no such should be ordained; and if any of either kind were surreptitiously admitted to orders, they were to be deposed [73], under penalty of deposition to the bishop himself, who should presume either to ordain any such, or not remove them when fraudulently ordained by others.

If any one made use of the secular powers to gain a promotion in the Church, by a rule of the Apostolical Canons [74] he was to be deposed, and all that communicated with him were to be suspended from Christian communion. If a bishop ordained any of his unworthy kindred for mere favour, by a rule of the same Apostolical Canons [75] the ordination was null, and

quis talium consecrator exstiterit, factum suum dissolvet.

[72] C. 19. (t. 2. p. 37 d.) *Περὶ τῶν Παυλιανισάντων, εἶτα προσφυγόντων τῇ Καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτέθειται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος· εἰ δέ τινες ἐν τῷ παρεληλυθότι χρόνῳ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ἐξητάσθησαν, εἰ μὲν ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀνεπίληπτοι φανεῖεν, ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείσθωσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς Καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου· εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀνάκρισις ἀνεπιτηδείους αὐτοὺς εὑρίσκοι, καθαιρεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς προσήκει, κ. τ. λ.*

[73] Vid. Felic. 3. Ep. 1. c. 5. [al. Ep. 7.] (CC. t. 4. p. 1077 b.) Illo per omnia custodito, ne ex eis unquam, qui in qualibet ætate alibi, quam in ecclesia Catholica, aut baptizati aut rebaptizati sunt, ad ecclesiasticam militiam prorsus non admittantur.. [al. permittantur]. Quoniam de suo ordine et communione videbitur ferre judicium, quisquis hoc violaverit institutum, vel qui non removerit eum, quem ex eis ad ministerium clericale obrepsisse cognoverit.

[74] C. 30. [al. 31. Labb. 29.] (Cotel. [c. 23.] v. 1. p. 441.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος κοσμικοῖς ἄρχουσι χρησάμενος δι' αὐτῶν ἐγκρατὴς ἐκκλησίας γένηται, καθαιρείσθω, καὶ ἀφοριζέσθω, καὶ οἱ κοινωνοῦντες αὐτῷ πάντες.*

[75] Ibid. c. 76. [al. 75.] (Cotel. [c. 68.] ibid. p. 447.) *Ὅτι μὴ χρὴ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ τῷ υἱῷ ἢ ἑτέρῳ συγγενεῖ χαριζόμενον τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, χειροτονεῖν οὓς αὐτὸς βούλεται· κληρονόμους γὰρ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτοῦ ποιεῖσθαι οὐ δίκαιον, τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ χαριζόμενον πάθει ἀνθρωπίνῳ· οὐ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ κληρονομίαν ὀφείλει τιθέναι. Εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο ποιήσοι, ἄκυρος μὲν ἔστω ἡ χειροτονία, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπιτιμάσθω ἀφορισμῷ.* [Labbe and Cossart (t. 1. p. 41 d.) read the canon thus: *Ὅτι οὐ χρὴ ἐπίσκοπον τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ υἱῷ ἢ ἑτέρῳ συγγενεῖ χαρίζεσθαι πάθει ἀνθρωπίνῳ· οὐ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ὑπὸ κληρονόμους ὀφείλει τιθέναι. Εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο ποιήσει,*

the bishop himself was to be suspended. And to this agrees the order made in the tenth Council of Toledo[76] to the same purpose. If a bishop ordained his own successor, by a rule of the Council of Antioch[77] his ordination was null, because it was clandestinely done without the consent of a provincial synod. Or if a bishop was ordained only by two bishops, for the same reason he was liable to be deposed, because it was done against the rule, which required the concurrence of the metropolitan and the provincial synod. Therefore the first Council of Orange ordered[78], in such a case, 'that if two bishops presumed to ordain a bishop by themselves, both the ordaining bishops were to be deposed; and if the bishop was ordained against his will, he should be put into the place of one of the deposed bishops: but if he was ordained by his own consent, then he also was to be deposed, that the rule prescribed by the ancient canons might be more cautiously observed. And the Council of Riez[79] actually deposed Armentarius, bishop of Ambrun, for this very reason, because he had not three bishops to ordain him.

All these were transgressions against the known rules of

ἄκυρος μενέτω ἡ χειροτονία, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐπιτιμάσθω ἀφορισμῷ. By these alterations the force of the canon is much weakened. ED.]

[76] C. 3. (t. 6. p. 461 c.) Agnovimus quosdam pontifices præcepti principis Apostolorum, qui ait, *Pascite, qui in vobis est, gregem, etc.*, ita esse immemores, ut quibusdam monasteriis, parochialibusque ecclesiis, aut suæ consanguinitatis personas, aut sui favoris participes, iniquum sæpe statuant in prælatum; ita illis providentes commoda inhonesta, ut eisdem deferantur, aut quæ proprio episcopo dare justus ordo poposcerit, aut quæ rapere deputati exactoris violentia potuerit. Proinde decenter omnibus placet, et in præsenti tale rescindere factum, et non esse de cætero faciendum. Nam quisquis pontificum deinceps, aut sanguine propinquis, aut favore sibi personis quibuscunque devinctis, talia commodare lucra tentaverit ausu nefandæ præsumptionis; et, quod visum fuerit, devocetur in irritum; et, qui ordinarit, annuæ excommunicationis ferat excidium.

[77] C. 23. (t. 2. p. 572 d.) *Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ ἐξεῖναι ἀντ' αὐτοῦ καθιστᾶν ἕτερον ἑαυτοῦ διάδοχον, κἂν πρὸς τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου τυγχάνει· εἰ δέ τι τοιοῦτο γίγνοιτο, ἄκυρον εἶναι τὴν κατάστασιν, φυλάττεσθαι δὲ τὸν θεσμὸν τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν, περιέχοντα, μὴ δεῖν ἄλλως γίνεσθαι, ἢ μετὰ συνόδου καὶ ἐπικρίσεως ἐπισκόπων, τῶν μετὰ τὴν κοίμησιν τοῦ ἀναπαυσαμένου τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐχόντων τοῦ προάγεσθαι τὸν ἄξιον.*

[78] C. 21. (t. 3. p. 1450 d.) [Duo si præsumpserint ordinare episcopum,] placuit de præsumptoribus, ut, sicubi contigerit duos episcopos invitum episcopum facere, auctoribus damnatis, unius eorum ecclesiæ ipse, qui vim passus est, substituatur; ... si voluntarium duo fecerint, et ipse damnabitur, quo cautius ea, quæ sunt antiquitus instituta, serventur.

[79] C. 1. See n. 56, preceding.

ordination, and imputed to men as immoralities, because they were violations of those good rules and orders which were made with great wisdom for the regular government and benefit of the Church: and therefore, if in any of these cases a crime was committed, the ordination was liable to be declared void originally by the discipline of the Church; and the clergy so ordained might be deposed, as soon as they were ordained, for the offences committed in their ordination. It is true indeed, the Church did not always actually depose such: but then she dispensed with her own rules, and such dispensations were only matters of favour and indulgence in some special cases, when the Church for prudential reasons thought fit to relax her discipline, and grant men such allowances, as in strictness of law they could not challenge: the general rules of discipline were still in force, though the Church did not always think it proper to put them strictly in execution.

No remedy allowed in this case by doing public penance for offences.

4. Neither was it any remedy in this case, that men made a solemn atonement for their crimes before the Church by doing public penance for them. For this was so far from opening their way to a regular ordination, that it was one of those things that rendered them incapable of it; or if by any secret methods they had attained it, this was thought a sufficient reason to withdraw their orders and degrade them. 'No one that has done pnblic penance,' says the fourth Council of Carthage[80], 'shall be ordained a clerk, though he be otherwise a good man: or, if by concealment from the bishop's knowledge this happen to be done, the clerk shall be deposed, because he confessed not at the time of his ordination that he had done penance in the church.' After the same manner the Roman Council[81] under Pope Hilary makes the doing of public penance as much a bar to a man's ordination as the profoundest ignorance or mangling his own body: and declares, 'that whatever bishop consecrates any such, he shall be obliged to reverse and cancel his own act,' that is, immediately deprive them of their orders, and degrade them. The like was determined by Pope Innocent in the case of one Modestus, who after he had done penance for many crimes, not only was

[80] C. 68. See before, ch. 3. s. 9. p. 31, the second part of n. 92.
[81] C. 3. See n. 71, preceding.

ordained a clergyman, which was against law, but also aimed at a bishopric. His determination upon the point is this[82]: 'that he ought not only to be defeated in his expectation of a bishopric, but' (according to the Canons of Nice[83]) 'be removed from all office among the clergy.' The third Council of Orleans enacted the same: 'No one shall be promoted to holy orders who has either been married to two wives, or married a widow, or done public penance, &c.' And[84], 'if any bishop wittingly act against these rules, he that is ordained shall be deprived of his office, and the bishop himself for six months sequestered or suspended from his ministration.' The Council of Agde[85] a little moderates the punishment, allowing such presbyters and deacons who had done penance to retain the name and honours of their orders, but forbidding deacons to minister the cup, or presbyters to consecrate the oblation of the altar. And the first Council of Toledo[86] degrades them, not totally, but allows deacons, thus ordained out of penitents, to take place among the subdeacons, that is, in the next inferior order.

Thus one way or other, every clergyman who had done penance whilst he was a layman, was corrected and punished for not declaring when he was ordained that he was in such a state as by the rules of the Church was made a just impediment to his ordination: and it was always thought scandalous and offensive, to allow any man to officiate as a public minister, who had before been a public penitent in the Church. The Church could admit them to pardon and reconciliation after penance, but would not allow them to aspire to any dignity, or continue them in any sacred office of the clerical function.

[82] Ep. 6. ad Episcopos Apuliæ, (CC. t. 2. p. 1262 c.)... Non solum ab episcopatus ambitione, sed etiam a clericatus removeatur officio.

[83] Cc. 9 et 10. See before, n. 49, preceding.

[84] C. Aurelian. 3. c. 6. (t. 5. p. 297 b.) De ipsis quoque, qui ordinandi sunt clerici, regulari custodiatur studio, ne aut duarum uxorum vir, aut renuptæ maritus, aut pœnitentiam professus.. ad ordines promoveatur. Quod si sciens episcopus contra hæc statuta agendum esse crediderit, is quidem, qui ordinatur, suscepto juxta anteriores canones privetur officio: sed et ille pro ordinationis temeritate sex mensibus a celebrandis officiis sequestretur.

[85] C. 43. See before, ch. 3. s. 9. p. 31, the fourth part of n. 92.

[86] C. 2. (t. 2. p. 1223 e.) Placuit, pœnitentes non admittantur ad clerum.. Si qui autem ante ordinati sunt diacones, inter subdiacones habeantur.

5. There was another sort of impediments of ordination, which, as I observed, arose not from any criminal action in men, but barely from their outward state and condition in the world; because it happened to be incompatible and inconsistent with the duties of the sacred order: and therefore many strict rules were made to prohibit the ordination of men in such a capacity, and to remove them back again from the clerical to a secular state, if they happened to be unwarily ordained against any such prohibitions.

Some impediments of ordination, arising from men's outward state and condition in the world, made sometimes occasion of their deprivation.

Thus, to instance in a few particulars, the military calling, (under which, as I have shown in another place[87], were comprehended not only the armed soldiery of the camp, but also all officers of the emperor's palace, and all apparitors and officials of judges or governors of provinces,) I say, the military calling in this comprehensive sense was reckoned inconsistent with the duties of the clerical life: because the men of this vocation were tied by the laws to the service of the empire; and therefore the laws both of Church and State forbad the admission of them into any order of the Church; and, if they were admitted by any fraud or mistake, they were liable to be deposed, and returned back to their ancient service. The Church had another reason also for refusing the soldiers of the camp; because probably they had imbrued their hands in blood, and no such were capable of ordination. Therefore, when some such were got into orders in the Spanish Churches, Pope Innocent wrote a sharp letter to the Synod of Toledo[88], telling them, 'that, by reason of the numbers of those who had been so ordained, it was proper to suffer them to continue, for fear of giving disturbance to the Church, and to leave them to the judgment of God: but for the future, if any such were or-

[87] B. 4. ch. 4. s. 1. v. 2. p. 54.

[88] Ep. 23. c. 4. (CC. t. 2. p. 1281 c.) De ordinationibus, quas pravæ consuetudinis vitio Hispanienses episcopos celebrare cognoscimus, fuerat aliquid secundum majorum traditionem statuendum, nisi perpenderemus, ne perturbationes quam plurimis ecclesiis moveremus. Quorum factum ita reprehendimus, ut propter numerum corrigendorum ea, quæ quoquo modo facta sunt, in dubium non vocemus, sed Dei potius judicio dimittamus.... Sed ne deinceps similia committantur, dilectionis vestræ maturitas providere debebit, ut tantæ usurpationi saltem nunc finis necessarius imponatur: eo videlicet constituto, ut si qui posthæc, adversus formas canonum, vel ad ecclesiasticum ordinem vel ad ipsum sacerdotium venire tentaverint, una cum creatoribus suis ipso, in quo inventi fuerint, ordine et honore priventur.

dained, both the ordainers and the ordained should be deposed.' And the Council of Toledo so far complied with his admonition, as to decree[89], 'that if any soldiers had been admitted to any of the inferior orders, they should never rise higher than to the dignity of deacons in the Church.'

The ordination of slaves and vassals was prohibited upon the same account, because they were tied by the law to the service of their temporal masters: so likewise all members of any civil company or society of tradesmen, because they were tied to the service of the commonwealth: and all those who went by the name of *curiales*, or *decuriones*, in the Roman government; being members of the *curia*, that is, *the court* or *common-council of any city*, to whose service they were tied by virtue of their estates and possessions. The ordination of all these sorts of men was generally forbidden both by the laws of Church and State: and, if any such were irregularly ordained, masters had liberty to reclaim their slaves; and the state, her soldiers; and any corporation or *curia*, their deserting members; and the Church, except in some special cases, was bound to depose them, and readily consented to restore them to their ancient secular station and employment again. Of all which I have given a large account in a former Book[90], and here only hint them to explain the discipline of the Church.

What crimes might occasion the deprivation of the clergy, or other censures, in the performance of their office. Clergymen to be censured: 1.

6. We have hitherto considered the causes and occasions of men's deprivation, arising from some irregularities committed in their entrance upon the clerical office: we are next to view what crimes might occasion their deprivation, or make them liable to other censures, in the performance of it.

And here, in the first place, it may be noted in general, that a clergyman was ever liable to be censured for any contempt of the canons. Concerning which there are directions given in the first Council of Carthage[91], and Turin[92], and Braga[93],

[89] C. 8. (ibid. p. 1224 e.) Si quis post baptismum militaverit, et chlamydem sumpserit, aut cingulum; etiamsi graviora non admiserit, si ad clerum admissus fuerit, diaconii non accipiat dignitatem.

[90] B. 4. ch. 4. s. 2. v. 2. p. 56.

[91] C. 14. (t. 2. p. 718 b.) Si quis statuta supergressus corruperit, vel pro nihilo habenda putaverit, si laicus est, communione, si clericus est, honore privetur.

[92] C. 2. [al. 3.] (ibid. p. 1156 d.) Proinde judicavit synodus, &c.

[93] Bracar. 1. c. 40. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 22.] (t. 5. p. 842 d.) Placuit, ut, quæcunque præcepta antiquorum canonum modo in concilio recitata sunt, nullus audeat præterire. Si quis autem quasi contumax transgreditur, ille necesse est ut de suo degradetur officio.

and several others: but as these equally affect both clergy and laity, I need not be more particular in relating them at length, having done it once before[94] in the general account of discipline in the former Book.

For contempt of the canons.

7. They were more especially liable to censure for negligence in their office, or any great irregularity committed in the execution of it. 'If a bishop or a presbyter be negligent toward the other clergy or people, not instructing them in the ways of godliness, he shall be suspended,' say the Apostolical Canons[95]; 'and if he continues in his neglect and slothfulness, he shall be deposed.' This neglect is termed sacrilege in the Civil Law[96], and accordingly to be punished under that denomination.

2. For negligence in their duty.

8. If the clergy neglected to use the public liturgy, or any part of it, the Lord's Prayer, the stated and received hymns, &c., they were liable to censure and condemnation. The fourth Council of Toledo has several canons to this purpose. 'If any priest or inferior clerk,' says one canon[97], 'neglect to use the Lord's Prayer daily, either in public or in private, let him be condemned for his pride, and be deprived of the honour of his order.' Another[98] establishes the use of the common prayers, and the doxology, *Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost!* and the Hymns of St. Hilary and St. Ambrose, composed in honour of the Apostles and Martyrs, under the penalty of excommunication to any priest in Spain or Gallicia, that should presume to reject them. Another[99]

3. For neglecting to use the public liturgy, Lord's Prayer, hymns, &c.

[94] B. 16. ch. 9. s. 5. v. 6. p. 385.

[95] C. 58. [al. 57.] (Cotel. [c. 50.] v. 1. p. 445.) Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἀμελῶν τοῦ κλήρου ἢ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ μὴ παιδεύων αὐτοὺς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, ἀφοριζέσθω· ἐπιμένων δὲ τῇ ῥαθυμίᾳ, καθαιρείσθω.

[96] Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 25. (t. 6. p. 57.) Qui divinæ legis sanctitatem aut nesciendo confundunt et offendunt, aut negligendo violant, sacrilegium committunt.

[97] C. 9. [al. 10.] (t. 5. p. 1708 e.) Quisquis ergo sacerdotum vel subjacentium clericorum [hanc] orationem Dominicam quotidie aut in publico aut in privato officio præterierit, propter superbiam judicatus, ordinis sui honore privetur [al. mulctetur].

[98] C. 12. [al. 13.] (ibid. p. 1710 c.) Sicut igitur orationes, ita et hymnos in laudem Dei compositos, nullus nostrum [al. vestrum] ulterius improbet, sed pari modo in Gallicia [al. Gallia] Hispaniaque celebrent, excommunicatione plectendi, qui hymnos rejicere fuerint ausi.

[99] C. 13. [al. 14.] (ibid. c.) Hymnum quoque Trium Puerorum, in quo universa cœli terræque creatura Dominum collaudat, et quem eccle-

confirms the use of the Hymn of the Three Children under the same penalty. A fourth canon[1] orders after what manner and form the *Gloria Patri!* shall be sung by all ecclesiastics: and a fifth[2] appoints the reading of the Apocalypse at a certain season of the year, between Easter and Pentecost, denouncing the same sentence and punishment of excommunication to any who should either reject the book as uncanonical, or neglect to use it in divine service according to appointment.

4. For making any alteration in the form of baptism.

9. If a minister made any material alteration in the manner of administering the sacraments, he was liable to be deposed for his presumption; as, if he either changed the general form of words used in baptism, or the trine immersion received by universal custom in all Churches. 'If any bishop or presbyter,' says one of the Apostolical Canons[3], 'baptize not according to the commandment of the Lord, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: but in Three Unoriginated Beings, or Three Sons, or Three Paracletes, let him be deposed.' And the next canon[4] says, 'If a bishop or presbyter use not three

sia Catholica per totum orbem diffusa celebrat, quidam sacerdotes in missa Dominicorum dierum et in solemnitatibus martyrum canere negligunt. Proinde hoc sanctum Concilium instituit, ut per omnes ecclesias Hispaniæ vel Galliciæ [al. Galliæ] in omnium missarum solemnitate idem in pulpito decantetur: communionem amissuri, qui et antiquam hujus hymni consuetudinem nostramque definitionem excesserint.

[1] C. 15. (ibid. e.) In fine Psalmorum non, sicut a quibusdam huc usque, *Gloria Patri*, sed, *Gloria et honor Patri* dicatur; David propheta dicente, *Afferte Domino gloriam et honorem:* et Ioannes evangelista in Apocalypsi, *Audivi vocem cœlestis exercitus dicentem, Honor et gloria Deo nostro sedenti in throno!* ac per hoc hæc duo sic oportet in terris dici, sicut in cœlis resonant. Universis igitur ecclesiasticis hanc observantiam damus, quam quisquis præterierit, communionis jacturam habebit.

[2] Ibid. c. 16. [al. 17.] (ibid. p. 1711 a.) Apocalypsin librum multorum Conciliorum auctoritas et synodica sanctorum præsulum Romanorum decreta Ioannis evangelistæ esse perscribunt, et inter divinos libros recipiendum, [*hic aliquid omnino deest,*] atque in ecclesia Dei prædicare contemnunt. Si quis eum deinceps aut non receperit, aut a Pascha usque ad Pentecosten missarum tempore in ecclesia non prædicaverit, excommunicationis sententiam habebit.

[3] C. 49. [al. 48.] (Cotel. [c. 41.] v. 1. p. 444.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Κυρίου διάταξιν μὴ βαπτίσῃ εἰς Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' εἰς τρεῖς Ἀνάρχους, ἢ τρεῖς Υἱοὺς, ἢ τρεῖς Παρακλήτους, καθαιρείσθω.

[4] [C. 50. [al. 49.] (Cotel. [c. 42.] ibid. c.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μυήσεως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλ' ἓν βάπτισμα, [τὸ] εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρείσθω· οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος, Εἰς τὸν θάνατόν μου βαπ-

immersions in the mystery of baptism, but only one immersion into the death of Christ, let him be deposed. For the Lord said not, Baptize into my death, but, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."'

5. For not frequenting divine service daily.

10. If any clergyman neglected to frequent the church and divine service daily, even when he did not officiate or celebrate himself, he was liable to be deposed, if after admonition he persisted obstinately in his contempt. To this purpose it is decreed by the first Council of Toledo[5], 'that if any presbyter, deacon, or subdeacon, or other clerk deputed to the service of the church, being in any city or place where there is a church, or castle, or village, or hamlet, shall neglect to come to church and the daily sacrifice, he shall be no longer accounted a clerk, unless upon admonition from the bishop he make satisfaction and obtain pardon for his offences.' The Council of Agde[6] reduces such to the communion of strangers, that is, suspends them from their office; and the law of Justinian[7] orders them to be degraded, because of the scandal they give to the laity by such neglect or contempts of divine service.

6. For meddling with secular offices.

11. If any clergyman entangled and embarrassed himself in secular offices, because this was an unnecessary avocation from his own employment, and hinderance to the proper business of his calling, he was liable to be deposed. 'No bishop or presbyter,' says one of the Apostolical Canons[8], 'shall thrust him-

τίσατε· ἀλλὰ, Πορευθέντες, κ. τ. λ. *Grischov.*]

[5] C. 5. (t. 2. p. 1224 b.) Presbyter, vel diaconus, vel subdiaconus, vel quilibet ecclesiæ deputatus clericus, si intra civitatem fuerit, vel in loco in quo ecclesia est, aut castella aut vici sunt aut villæ, si ad ecclesiam aut ad sacrificium quotidianum non venerit [al. accesserit], clericus non habeatur, si castigatus, per satisfactionem veniam ab episcopo noluit promereri.

[6] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 1383 b.) Contumaces vero clerici, prout dignitatis ordo permiserit, ab episcopis corrigantur: et si qui prioris gradus, elati superbia, communionem fortasse contempserint, aut ecclesiam frequentare vel officium suum implere neglexerint, peregrina eis communio tribuatur: ita ut, cum eos pœnitentia correxerit, rescripti in matricula gradum suum dignitatemque recipiant.

[7] Cod. l. 1. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 41. n. 10. (t. 4. p. 113.) ... Καὶ τοὺς μὴ εὑρισκομένους ἀμέμπτως ταῖς λειτουργίαις προσκαρτεροῦντας ἔξω τοῦ κλήρου καθίστασθαι [κελεύομεν].

[8] C. 81. [al. 80.] (Cotel. [c. 72.] ibid. p. 447.) Εἴπομεν ὅτι μὴ [al. οὐ] χρὴ ἐπίσκοπον καθιέναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς δημοσίας διοικήσεις, ἀλλὰ προσευκαιρεῖν ταῖς ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς χρείαις· ἢ πειθέσθω οὖν τοῦτο μὴ ποιεῖν, ἢ καθαιρείσθω· οὐδεὶς γὰρ δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν, κατὰ τὴν Κυριακὴν παρακέλευσιν.

self *εἰς δημοσίας διοικήσεις, into any public administrations or employments*, but keep himself always in readiness for the service of the Church. Let him therefore either incline his mind not to do this, or let him be deposed. For no man can serve two masters, according to what the Lord appointed.' And another canon[9] says, 'A bishop, presbyter, or deacon, that employs himself in a military life, and would retain both a Roman office and an ecclesiastical function together, shall be deposed. For we must "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and unto God the things that are God's."' The first Council of Carthage[10] forbids 'clergymen to take upon them the administration or stewardship of any houses, because the Apostle says, "No man that warreth (in God's service) entangleth himself in the affairs of this life." Therefore clergymen must either quit their stewardships, or stewards their clerical office.'

But because necessity or charity might seem to require clergymen to engage a little in secular affairs in some special cases, the Council of Chalcedon[11] delivers the rule with some distinction: 'Whereas we are informed, that some of the clergy for filthy lucre's sake hire other men's possessions, and exercise themselves in worldly affairs, neglecting the service of God, living in the houses of secular men, and taking upon them the management of their estates out of covetousness and the love

[9] C. 83. [al. 82.] (Cotel. [c. 74.] ibid.) Ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, στρατείᾳ σχολάζων, καὶ βουλόμενος ἀμφότερα κατέχειν, Ῥωμαϊκὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἱερατικὴν διοίκησιν, καθαιρείσθω· τὰ γὰρ Καίσαρος, Καίσαρι· καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, Θεῷ.—Vide c. 7. [al. 6.] (Cotel. [c. 4.] ibid. p. 437 d.) Κοσμικὰς φροντίδας μὴ ἀναλαμβανέσθω· εἰ δὲ μή γε, καθαιρείσθω.

[10] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 616 [corrige, p. 716] a.) . . . . Non accedant ad actus seu administrationem vel procurationem domorum.

[11] C. 3. (t. 4. p. 755 d.) Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴ ἁγίαν σύνοδον, ὅτι τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ κατειλεγμένων τινὲς δι' οἰκείαν αἰσχροκέρδειαν ἀλλοτρίων κτημάτων γίνονται μισθωταὶ, καὶ πράγματα κοσμικὰ ἐργολαβοῦσι, τῆς μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργίας καταρραθυμοῦντες, τοὺς δὲ τῶν κοσμικῶν ὑποτρέχοντες οἴκους, καὶ οὐσιῶν χειρισμοὺς ἀναδεχόμενοι διὰ φιλαργυρίαν. Ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος, μηδένα τοῦ λοιποῦ, μὴ ἐπίσκοπον, μὴ κληρικὸν, μὴ μονάζοντα, ἢ μισθοῦσθαι κτήματα, ἢ πράγματα, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν ἑαυτὸν κοσμικαῖς διοικήσεσι· πλὴν εἰ μή που ἐκ νόμων καλοῖτο εἰς ἀφηλίκων ἀπαραίτητον ἐπιτροπὴν, ἢ ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἐπιτρέψοι φροντίζειν πραγμάτων, ἢ ὀρφανῶν, καὶ χηρῶν ἀπρονοήτων, καὶ τῶν προσώπων τῶν μάλιστα τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς δεομένων βοηθείας, διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ Κυρίου. Εἰ δέ τις παραβαίνειν τὰ ὡρισμένα τοῦ λοιποῦ ἐπιχειρήσοι, ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις.

of money; the holy synod decrees, that henceforth no bishop, clergyman, or monk, shall either hire any possessions or put himself into any secular administrations, unless by the law he be called to the unavoidable care or guardianship of orphans, or the bishop of the place permit him to be the procurator of the church-revenues, or to take the care of widows and orphans and such other helpless persons as need the assistance of the Church, which may be done in the fear of the Lord. If any one henceforward transgress these rules, he shall be liable to ecclesiastical censure.'

There are many other laws, forbidding them to be sureties, or pleaders at the bar for themselves or others in any civil contest, or to follow any secular trade or merchandise; but these with some limitations and exceptions; of all which, because I have had occasion to discourse more fully in a former Book[12], I need say no more in this place.

7. For deserting their own church without license to go to another.

12. It was another crime of the like nature, for a clergyman to desert and relinquish his own church, to which he was originally fixed and appointed by his ordination, without license from the bishop to whose jurisdiction he belonged. For though this was not properly an absolute and universal renunciation and desertion of the Church's service; yet it was a manifest breach of good order, and a transgression of an useful rule established by often repeated injunctions over the Church universal, that no clerk should leave his own bishop's church or diocese without his consent, nor find reception in any other, to the prejudice of the bishop who first ordained him. 'If any presbyter, deacon, or other clerk,' say the Apostolical Canons[13], 'forsake his own diocese to go to another, and there continue without the consent of his own bishop; we decree, that such an one shall no longer continue to minister as a clerk, (especially if after admonition he refuse to return,) but only be admitted

[12] B. 6. ch. 4. ss. 9, 10, 11, &c. v. 1. pp. 278, &c.

[13] Cc. 15, 16. [al. 14.] (Cotel. [c. 12.] v. 1. p. 439.) *Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τῶν κληρικῶν, ἀπολείψας τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παροικίαν εἰς ἑτέραν ἀπελθῇ, καὶ παντελῶς μεταστὰς διατρίβῃ ἐν ἄλλῃ παροικίᾳ παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου· τοῦτον κελεύομεν μηκέτι λειτουργεῖν, εἰ μάλιστα προσκαλουμένου αὐτὸν ἐπανελθεῖν ἐπισκόπου οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν, ἐπιμένων τῇ ἀταξίᾳ· ὡς λαϊκὸς μέν τοι ἐκεῖσε κοινωνείτω. Εἰ δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, παρ' ᾧ τυγχάνουσιν, παρ' οὐδὲν ἡγησάμενος τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν ὁρισθεῖσαν ἀργίαν, δέξηται αὐτοὺς ὡς κληρικοὺς, ἀφοριζέσθω ὡς διδάσκαλος ἀταξίας.*

to communicate as a layman. And if the bishop, to whom they repair, shall entertain them in the quality of clergymen, he shall be excommunicated, as a master of disorder.' The same rule is frequently repeated in the ancient canons, to which I have referred the reader in another place[14].

8. For officiating after the condemnation of a synod.

13. If any clergyman pretended to officiate after he was censured and condemned by a synod, before he was absolved by that or another synod, he was to be deposed for his contempt, without hope of restitution. This was first decreed in the Apostolical Canons[15]: 'If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, who is justly deposed for his crimes, presume to meddle with the service belonging to his order, let him be wholly cut off from the communion of the Church.' The Council of Antioch[16] repeats this rule a little more explicitly: 'If any bishop, who is deposed by a synod, or presbyter, or deacon, who is deposed by his own bishop, presume to officiate in their ministry, they shall have no hopes of being restored even by another synod, nor any room left for satisfaction: and all that communicate with them shall be cast out of the Church, especially if they do it after they are apprised of the sentence pronounced against them.' This canon is repeated and confirmed by the great Council of Chalcedon[17], as a standing rule then inserted into the code of the universal Church.

9. For appealing from the censure of a provincial synod to foreign Churches.

14. In this case the Church allowed of appeals, that if any one was injured or oppressed by any rash or violent proceeding, he might have justice done him in a provincial synod. But then this liberty of appeals was limited to the place or province where the party lived, and he might not fly to another country under pretence of more impartial justice. The bishops of Rome

[14] B. 6. ch. 4. s. 4. v. 2. p. 267.

[15] C. 28. [al. 27.] (Cotel. [c. 21.] ibid. p. 441.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, καθαιρεθεὶς δικαίως ἐπὶ ἐγκλήμασι φανεροῖς, τολμήσειεν ἐφάψασθαι τῆς ποτὲ ἐγχειρισθείσης αὐτῷ λειτουργίας· οὗτος παντάπασιν ἐκκοπτέσθω τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[16] C. 4. (t. 2. p. 564 b.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδου καθαιρεθεὶς, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, τολμήσειέν τι πρᾶξαι τῆς λειτουργίας, εἴτε ὁ ἐπίσκοπος κατὰ τὴν προάγουσαν συνήθειαν, εἴτε ὁ διάκονος· μηκέτι ἐξὸν εἶναι αὐτῷ, μηδ' ἐν ἑτέρᾳ συνόδῳ ἐλπίδα ἀποκαταστάσεως, μήτε ἀπολογίας χώραν ἔχειν· ἀλλὰ δὲ τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας αὐτῷ πάντας ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ μαθόντες τὴν ἀπόφασιν τὴν κατὰ τῶν προειρημένων ἐξενεχθεῖσαν τολμήσειαν αὐτοῖς κοινωνεῖν.

[17] Act. 4. (t. 4. p. 538 c.) The same words.

indeed sometimes laid claim to a peculiar prerogative in this matter, as if they had power to receive appellants from other Churches, and hear and determine the causes arising in foreign countries at the greatest distance and under different jurisdictions: but St. Austin and the African fathers stoutly opposed these encroachments, and withal made a decree, 'that if any African clerk appealed from the sentence of his own bishop, or a synod of select judges, he should appeal to none but African synods or the primates of the provinces. And if any presumed to appeal beyond seas, (meaning to Rome,) he should be excluded from all communion in the African Churches.' This decree was first made in the Council of Milevis[18], and afterward confirmed by several acts of their general synods, made upon the famous case and appeal of Apiarius, an African presbyter, whom Pope Zosimus pretended to restore to communion after he had been deposed by an African Council. What opposition the African fathers made to this presumption, during the lives of three Popes successively, Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestin, and what arguments they went upon, I have formerly shown[19] out of the canons of the African Code: and I only note it here with all brevity, to explain the ancient discipline in this point from the current tenour and practice of the Church.

10. For refusing to end controversies before bishops, and flying to a secular tribunal.

15. Another thing which subjected clergymen to ecclesiastical censure was, refusing to end their controversies before bishops, and choosing rather to fly to the secular tribunals. The laws of the State permitted, and the laws of the Church obliged them to bring all their disputes with one another under the cognizance of an ecclesiastical tribunal. I have had occasion, once before[20], to speak of this as a privilege and immunity granted to the clergy by the imperial laws, and all I shall remark further concerning it here, is only what relates to the discipline of the Church: in reference to which the Council of

[18] C. 22. (t. 2. p. 1542 e.) Placuit, ut presbyteri, diaconi, vel cæteri inferiores clerici, in causis quas habuerint, si de judiciis episcoporum suorum questi fuerint, vicini episcopi eos audiant, et inter eos, quidquid est, finiant, adhibiti ab eis ex consensu episcoporum suorum. Quod si et ab eis provocandum putaverint, non provocent nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad primates provinciarum suarum. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverint [al. putaverit] appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem suscipiantur [al. suscipiatur].

[19] Cc. 135, 136, 137, 138. See b. 9. ch. 1. s. 11. v. 3. p. 241.

[20] B. 5. ch. 1. s. 4. v. 2. p. 108.

Chalcedon[21] decreed, 'that if any clergyman had a controversy with another, he should not leave his own bishop, and betake himself to a secular court; but first have an hearing before his own bishop, or such arbitrators as the parties should choose with the bishop's approbation. Otherwise he should be liable to canonical censure: which censure in the African Church was the loss of his place, whether he were bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other inferior clerk, that declined the sentence of an ecclesiastical court, in a criminal cause, and betook himself to a secular court for justice: or, if it was a civil cause, he must lose whatever advantage he gained by the action, as the third Council of Carthage[22] determined in the case, because he despised the whole Church, in that he could not confide in any ecclesiastical persons to be his judges. The Council of Milevis[23] added to this, 'that no clergyman should so much as petition the emperor to assign him secular judges in any case, but only ecclesiastical, under pain of deprivation.'

And this seems to be the true meaning of those two famous canons of the Council of Antioch, which have been so generally mistaken by modern authors, as if they had been made only

[21] C. 9. (t. 4. p. 759 c.) *Εἴ τις κληρικὸς πρὸς κληρικὸν πρᾶγμα ἔχοι, μὴ καταλιμπανέτω τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ ἐπὶ κοσμικὰ δικαστήρια κατατρεχέτω· ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὴν ὑπόθεσιν γυμναζέτω παρὰ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἢ γοῦν γνώμῃ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, παρ' οἷς ἂν τὰ ἀμφότερα μέρη βούλεται, τὰ τῆς δίκης συγκροτείσθω· εἰ δέ τις παρὰ ταῦτα ποιήσει, κανονικοῖς ὑποκείσθω ἐπιτιμίοις.*—Vid. C. Venet. c. 9. (ibid. p. 1056 a.) Clericis, nisi ex permissu episcoporum suorum, sæcularia judicia adire non liceat. Sed si quis fortassis episcopi sui judicium cœperit habere suspectum, aut ipsi de proprietate aliqua adversus ipsum episcopum fuerit nata contentio, aliorum episcoporum audientiam, non sæcularium potestatum, debebit ambire. Aliter a communione habeatur alienus.

[22] C. 9. (t. 2. p. 1168 e.) Placuit, ut quisquis episcoporum, presbyterorum, et diaconorum, seu clericorum, cum in ecclesia ei crimen fuerit intentatum, vel civilis causa fuerit commota, si, relicto ecclesiastico judicio, publicis judiciis purgari voluerit, etiam si pro ipso fuerit prolata sententia, locum suum amittat: et hoc in criminali judicio. In civili vero perdat, quod evicit, si locum suum obtinere voluerit. Cui enim ad eligendos judices undique patet auctoritas, ipse se indignum fraterno consortio judicat; qui, de universa ecclesia male sentiendo, de judicio sæculari poscit auxilium; cum privatorum Christianorum causas Apostolus ad ecclesiam deferri, atque ibi determinari, præcipiat.

[23] C. 19. (ibid. p. 1542 a.) Placuit ut, quicunque ab imperatore cognitionem judiciorum publicorum petierit, honore proprio privetur. Si autem episcopale judicium ab imperatore postulaverit, nihil ei obsit.

by a cabal of Arians, against the person of Athanasius, when indeed they contain nothing but an ancient rule of discipline universally observed throughout the Church. The words of the canons are these[24]: 'If any bishop, or presbyter, or any one within the canon or roll of the clergy belonging to the Church, shall presume to address the emperor without the consent and letters of the provincial bishops, and especially of the metropolitan, he shall be rejected and expelled, not only from communion, but from whatever honour and dignity he enjoys, as one that fills the prince's ears with troublesome complaints against the law of the Church. But if any necessary cause call him to address the prince, he shall do it by the advice and consent of the metropolitan and the rest of the provincial bishops, who in that case shall assist him with their recommendatory letters also.' The other canon[25] says, 'If any presbyter or deacon is deposed by his bishop, or any bishop by a synod, he shall not presume to trouble the emperor with complaints, but have recourse to a greater synod of bishops, and lay the justice of his cause before them, and wait for their discussion and determination. But if in contempt of this method he trouble the prince, he shall have no pardon, nor room for defence, nor any hopes of restitution.'

The generality of modern writers, following the censure passed upon this canon by the famous Antonius Augustinus[26] as well as by Baronius[27], commonly reckon it a

[24] C. 11. (ibid. p. 565 e.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ κανόνος, ἄνευ γνώμης καὶ γραμμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπων, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ κατὰ τὴν μητρόπολιν, ὁρμήσειεν πρὸς βασιλέα ἀπελθεῖν, τοῦτον ἀποκηρύττεσθαι καὶ ἀπόβλητον γίνεσθαι, οὐ μόνον τῆς κοινωνίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀξίας, ἧς μετέχων τυγχάνει, ὡς παρενοχλεῖν τολμῶντα τὰς τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως ἡμῶν ἀκοὰς, παρὰ τὸν θεσμὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Εἰ δὲ ἀναγκαία καλοίη χρεία πρὸς βασιλέα ὁρμᾷν, τοῦτο πράττειν μετὰ σκέψεως καὶ γνώμης τοῦ κατὰ τὴν μητρόπολιν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπου, ἢ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ, τοῖς τε τούτων γράμμασιν ἐφοδιάζεσθαι.*

[25] C. 12. (ibid. p. 568 a.) *Εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου καθαιρεθεὶς πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ συνόδου, ἐνοχλῆσαι τολμήσειε τὰς βασιλέως ἀκοὰς, δέον ἐπὶ μείζονα ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι, καὶ, ἃ νομίζει δίκαια ἔχειν, προσαναφέρειν πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐξέτασίν τε καὶ ἐπίκρισιν ἐκδέχεσθαι. Εἰ δὲ, τούτων ὀλιγωρήσας, ἐνοχλήσειεν τῷ βασιλεῖ, καὶ τοῦτον μηδεμιᾶς συγγνώμης ἀξιοῦσθαι, μηδὲ χώραν ἀπολογίας ἔχειν, μηδὲ ἐλπίδα ἀποκαταστάσεως προσδοκᾷν.*

[26] De Emendatione Gratiani, l. 1. dialog. 11. (p. 123.) Hoc esse caput arbitror contra Beatum Athanasium scriptum, quod reprehendit Julius in Epistola ad hos eosdem episcopos Antiochiæ congregatos; idem contra Ioannem Chrysostomum dum objiceretur, ab eo responsum est, hæreticorum canonem fuisse.

[27] An. 341. n. 28. [al. 30.] (t. 3.

canon made by the Arian faction against Athanasius; and say, it is the same canon that was alleged against Chrysostom by his adversaries, and rejected by him and his advocates, as an Arian canon, in the following ages. But the learned Schelstrate, who has particularly vindicated the authority of the Council of Antioch[28], shows this to be a vulgar error; demonstrating, that the Arian canon was very different from this, and that this canon of Antioch was conformable to the received discipline of the ancient Church. For as such, it was inserted into the Code of the universal Church, and acknowledged by the Council of Chalcedon, and all the collectors of the canons, Ferrandus, Diaconus, Martin Bracarensis, and the Capitulars of Charles the Great. Besides that the Council of Vannes has a canon[29] to the same purpose: 'If a clerk suspects the judgment of his own bishop, or has any controversy with him concerning any property, he shall require an hearing before other bishops, and not before the secular powers: otherwise he shall

p. 548 d.) Hic canon adversus Athanasium, ut apparet, editus; quippe quem dicerent Eusebiani, literis tantum imperatoris subnixum, qui depositus fuerat in Conciliabulo Tyrio, in suam ecclesiam Alexandrinam reversum esse. Cum igitur idem ipse canon adversus Ioannem Chrysostomum ab ejus adversariis adduceretur; qui ipsum defendebant, libera voce dicebant, canonem ab Arianis sancitum et per Sardicense Concilium penitus esse sublatum, atque irritum omnino redditum, etc.

[28] C. Antioch. Restitut. Schol. in Can. 12. (p. 541.) At gravem peritorum errorem primum aperui parte II. Antiquitatis Illustratæ, ubi canonem a Theophilo quondam D. Chrysostomo objectum, quem Socrates, Sozomenus, Georgius patriarcha Alexandrinus, aliique in odium D. Athanasii ab Arianis confectum testantur, in medium attuli ex Palladio Helenopolitano episcopo, ipsius Ioannis Chrysostomi discipulo, et est sequens: *Si quis episcopus aut presbyter, sive juste sive injuste depositus, ex se ipso absque synodo in ecclesiam redierit, hic jam excusationis non habeat locum, sed omnino expellatur.* Hic quondam oculos lectoris advocabam, nunc fidem peritorum omnium expeto, an post adductum e tenebris canonem illum, quem Chrysostomus, Innocentius, aliique antiquiores ab Arianis promanasse judicabant, quisquam invenire possit, qui eum canonem inter Antiochenos duodecimum merito sustineat? Tantum re vera abest, cuiquam videri id ulterius posse, ut neminem posthac inveniri existimem, quin exclamaturus sit, utrumque canonem toto cœlo differre. Canon a Chrysostomo rejectus agit de illis, qui, damnati juste vel injuste, sine nova synodo sedem suam recuperant. Canon vero duodecimus Antiochenus agit de illis, qui depositi imperatoris auribus molestiam afferunt; ut evidens sit, canones illos eadem de re non egisse, multo minus eodem sensu idem pertractasse, etc.

[29] C. 9. (t. 4. p. 1056 a.) ..... [Clericus] si fortasse episcopi sui judicium cœperit habere suspectum, aut ipsi de proprietate aliqua adversus ipsum episcopum fuerit nata contentio, aliorum episcoporum audientiam, non sæcularium potestatum, debebit ambire. Aliter a communione habebitur alienus.

be cast out of communion.' From all which it is plain, nothing more was intended by the Council of Antioch, but only to oblige clergymen to end all their controversies before a synod of bishops, which is agreeable to the general rule and discipline of the Church.

11. For being re-baptized or re-ordained.

16. The laws of the Church were further severe against all re-ordinations in the clergy, and against all re-baptizations both in clergymen and laymen: and therefore any clergyman, who submitted either actively or passively to either of these, rendered himself obnoxious to the highest censure. 'If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon,' say the Apostolical Canons[30], 'receive a second ordination, both the ordainer and the ordained shall be deposed; except it appear that his first ordination was given him by heretics: for they that are baptized or ordained by heretics are neither to be accounted clergymen nor faithful laymen.' Optatus[31] says, that, among other reasons why Donatus was condemned and deposed by the Council of Rome under Melchiades, this was one, 'that he had given imposition of hands to such bishops as had lapsed in time of persecution, which was contrary to the custom of the Catholic Church.' If imposition of hands there signify ordination, then his crime was that he had re-ordained them: but if, as Albaspinæus[32] thinks both in his notes and observations, it only means imposition of hands in penance, then we are to lay no stress upon it, because it relates to a different subject. As to re-baptization, the case was the same: the Apostolical Canons[33] appointed, 'that if any bishop or presbyter presumed to give a second baptism after a true one once received, he should be degraded.' And the Council of Rome[34], under Felix III, de-

[30] C. 68. [al. 67.] (Cotel. [c. 60.] v. 1. p. 446.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος δευτέραν χειροτονίαν δέξεται παρά τινος, καθαιρείσθω καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ χειροτονήσας· εἰ μὴ δείξοι παρὰ αἱρετικῶν αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὴν χειροτονίαν·* [al. *εἰ μήγε ἄρα συσταίη, ὅτι παρὰ αἱρετικῶν ἔχει τὴν χειροτονίαν·*] *τοὺς γὰρ παρὰ τοιούτων βαπτισθέντας ἢ χειροτονηθέντας οὔτε πιστοὺς οὔτε κληρικοὺς εἶναι δυνατόν.*

[31] L. 1. p. 44. (p. 26.) In Donatum sunt hæ sententiæ latæ; quod confessus sit, se rebaptizasse et episcopis lapsis manum imposuisse: quod ab ecclesia alienum est.

[32] [In loc. cit. (ibid. 27. n. r.) De pœnitentiæ manus impositione, non autem de reordinatione, hæc verba explicanda esse, docuimus in Observationibus. *Grischov.*]

[33] C. 47. [al. 46.] (Cotel. [c. 39.] v. 1. p. 444.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος τὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἔχοντα βάπτισμα, ἐὰν ἄνωθεν βαπτίσῃ, . . . καθαιρείσθω.*

[34] Vid. Felic. Ep. 1. c. 2. (CC. [Ep. 7.] t. 4. p. 1076 b.) Ut ab ecclesiæ summitatibus inchoemus, eos,

creed, 'that if a bishop, presbyter, or deacon suffered himself to be so re-baptized, he should be degraded, and do penance all his life, without being suffered to communicate either in the prayers of the faithful, or the prayers of the catechumens, and only be admitted to lay-communion at the hour of death; because such had not only denied their orders, but their Christianity, and openly professed themselves Pagans, by being re-baptized. The civil law confirmed these censures of the Church, and added some temporal penalties to give them greater force; of which the reader may find a more particular account in a former Book[35].

12. For denying themselves to be clergymen.

17. It was a crime of the like nature for any clergyman to deny his order in words, or dissemble his profession before a Jew or an Heathen; because this was but one degree below the renunciation of his religion. 'If any clergyman,' says one of the Apostolical Canons[36], 'through human fear of a Jew, or an Heathen, or an heretic, deny the name of Christ, let him be cast out of the Church: if he deny the name of a clergyman, let him be deposed; but upon his repentance, let him be received as a layman.'

13. For publishing apocryphal books.

18. If any clergyman was convict of publishing any apocryphal books, or books written by impious men under false titles, as sacred and pious writings, to the corruption and seducement both of laity and clergy, by another of the Apostolical Canons[37] he was to be deposed. Tertullian[38] gives an instance

quos episcopos, presbyteros, vel diaconos fuisse constiterit, et seu optantes forsitan, seu coactos lavacri illius unici salutarisque claruerit fecisse jacturam, et Christum, quem non solum dono regenerationis, verum etiam gratia percepti honoris induerant, exuisse, cum constet neminem ad secundum tinctionem venire potuisse, nisi palam se Christianum negaverit, et professus fuerit se esse Paganum. Quod cum generaliter sit in omnibus exsecrandum, multo magis in episcopis, presbyteris, diaconibus, auditu saltem dictuque probatur horrendum. Sed quia idem Dominus atque Salvator clementissimus est, et neminem vult perire, usque ad exitus sui diem in pœnitentia, si resipiscunt, jacere conveniet: nec orationi non modo fidelium, sed ne catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communio laica tantum in morte reddenda est. Quam rem diligentius explorare vel facere probatissimi sacerdotis cura debebit.

[35] B. 12. ch. 5. s. 7. v. 4. p. 258.

[36] C. 62. [al. 61.] (Cotel. [c. 54.] v. 1. p. 445.) Εἴ τις κληρικὸς διὰ φόβον ἀνθρώπινον, Ἰουδαίου, ἢ Ἕλληνος, ἢ αἱρετικοῦ, ἀρνήσηται· εἰ μὲν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀφοριζέσθω [al. ἀποβαλλέσθω]· εἰ δὲ [καὶ] τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κληρικοῦ, καθαιρείσθω· μετανοήσας δὲ, ὡς λαϊκὸς δεχθήτω.

[37] C. 60. [al. 59.] (Cotel. [c. 52.] ibid.) Εἴ τις τὰ ψευδεπίγραφα τῶν

of the exercise of discipline in this case upon an Asiatic presbyter, who wrote the book called *the Acts of Paul and Thecla*, under the feigned name of the Apostle. He pleaded in his own behalf, that he did it out of love to St. Paul; but this would not satisfy the Church: for upon conviction and confession of the facts she obliged the man to quit his office for his transgression.

14. For superstitious abstinence from flesh, wine, &c.

19. Clergymen were likewise liable to be deposed for any superstitious abstinence from flesh, wine, marriage, or any the like innocent and lawful things; when they refrained from them, not for exercise sake, but out of a false and heretical opinion, that they were polluted and unclean. There was always a grand dispute about meats and marriage between the Church and several sects that opposed her continually upon this point. Many heretics, such as the Manichees, Priscillianists, and others, pretended to be more spiritual and refined, because they abstained from wine and flesh as things unlawful and unclean; and upon this score censured the Church as impure and carnal, for allowing men in the just and moderate use of them. If any clergymen therefore so far complied with heretics, as either in their judgment to approve their errors, or in their practice by an universal abstinence to give suspicion of their siding with them; they made themselves obnoxious to the highest censures. The Apostolical Canons[39] order, 'that if any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other clerk, abstain from marriage, flesh, or wine, not for exercise but abhorrence; forgetting that God made all things very good, and created man male and female, and speaking evil of the workmanship of God; unless he correct his error, he shall be deposed, and cast out of the Church.' Another canon[40] gives the reason of

ἀσεβῶν βιβλία, ὡς ἅγια, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας δημοσιεύει, ἐπὶ λύμῃ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ κλήρου, καθαιρείσθω.

[38] De Bapt. c. 17. (p. 231 b.) Quod si quæ Paulo perperam adscripta sunt, ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique defendunt; sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse.

[39] C. 51. [al. 50.] (Cotel. [c. 43.] t. 1. p. 445.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ, γάμων καὶ κρεῶν καὶ οἴνου, οὐ δι' ἄσκησιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ βδελυρίαν ἀπέχεται, ἐπιλαθόμενος, ὅτι παντὰ καλὰ λίαν, καὶ ὅτι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ βλασφημῶν διαβάλλει τὴν δημιουργίαν, ἢ διορθούσθω, ἢ καθαιρείσθω καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀποβαλλέσθω· ὡσαύτως καὶ λαϊκός.*

[40] C. 53. [al. 52.] (Cotel. [c. 45.] ibid.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτε-*

this censure: 'Because such an one has a seared conscience, and is the cause of scandal to the people.' The Council of Ancyra[41] condemns the same error, and inflicts the like penalty of degradation upon any clergymen that should be found guilty of it. And in the first Council of Braga an order[42] was made, 'that all clergymen who abstained from flesh should sometimes eat herbs boiled with flesh, to avoid the suspicion of the Priscillian heresy. And if they refused to do this, they should be excommunicated, and removed from their office, according to the direction of the ancient canons, as men suspected of that heresy,' which then reigned in the Spanish Churches.

15. For eating of blood.

20. But, on the other hand, because it was the custom of the Catholic Church, almost till the time of St. Austin, to abstain from eating of blood, in compliance with the rule given by the Apostles to the Gentile converts: therefore by the most ancient laws of the Church all clergymen were obliged to abstain from it under pain of degradation. This is evident from the Apostolical Canons[43], and those of Gangra[44], and the second Council of Orleans[45], and the Council of Trullo[46]. But as this

ρος, ἢ διάκονος, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν ἑορτῶν οὐ μεταλαμβάνει κρεῶν καὶ οἴνου, βδελυσσόμενος, καὶ οὐ δι' ἄσκησιν, καθαιρείσθω, ὡς κεκαυτηριασμένος τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν, καὶ αἴτιος σκανδάλου πολλοῖς γινόμενος.

[41] C. 15. [al. 14.] (t. 1. p. 1461 a.) Τοὺς ἐν κλήρῳ πρεσβυτέρους, ἢ διακόνους ὄντας, καὶ ἀπεχομένους κρεῶν, ἔδοξεν ἐφάπτεσθαι, καὶ οὕτως, εἰ βούλοιντο, κρατεῖν ἑαυτῶν· εἰ δὲ βούλοιντο ὡς μηδὲ τὰ μετὰ κρεῶν βαλλόμενα λάχανα ἐσθίειν, καὶ εἰ μὴ ὑπείκοιεν τῷ κανόνι, πεπαῦσθαι αὐτοὺς τῆς τάξεως.—Vid. C. Gangrens. c. 2. See n. 44, following.

[42] C. 32. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 14.] (t. 5. p. 841 c.) Placuit, ut quicunque in clero cibo carnium non utuntur, pro amputanda suspicione Priscillianæ hæresis, vel olera cocta cum carnibus tantum prægustare cogantur. Quod si contempserint, secundum quod de his talibus sancti patres antiquitus statuerunt, necesse est, eos pro suspicione hæresis hujus, officio excommunicatos omnibus modis removeri.

[43] C. 63. [al. 62.] (Cotel. [c. 55.] v. 1. p. 446.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ, φάγῃ κρέας [al. κρέα] ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ, ἢ θηριάλωτον, ἢ θνησιμαῖον, καθαιρείσθω· τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ νόμος ἀπεῖπεν· ἐὰν δὲ λαϊκὸς ᾖ, ἀφοριζέσθω.

[44] C. 2. (t. 2. p. 416 d.) Εἴ τις ἐσθίοντα κρέα χωρὶς αἵματος καὶ εἰδωλοθύτου καὶ πνικτοῦ, μετ' εὐλαβείας καὶ πίστεως, κατακρίνοι, ὡς ἂν διὰ τὸ μεταλαμβάνειν ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντα, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[45] C. 20. (t. 4. p. 1782 d.) Catholici, ... qui cibis idolorum cultibus immolatis gustu illicitæ præsumptionis utuntur, ab ecclesiæ cœtibus arceantur. Similiter et hi, qui bestiarum morsibus extincta, vel quolibet morbo aut casu suffocata vescuntur.

[46] C. 67. (t. 6. p. 1171 e.) Ἡ θεία ἡμῖν Γραφὴ ἐνετείλατο ἀπέχεσθαι αἵματος καὶ πνικτοῦ καὶ πορνείας. Τοῖς οὖν διὰ τὴν λίχνον γαστέρα αἷμα οἱουδήποτε ζώου τέχνῃ τινὶ κατασκευάζουσιν ἐδώδιμον, καὶ οὕτω τοῦτο ἐσθίουσι, προσφόρως ἐπιτιμῶμεν. Εἴ τις οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν αἷμα ζώου ἐσθίειν

was looked upon by some only as a temporary injunction, so it appears from St. Austin[47], that in his time it was of no force in the African Church. For, he says, in his time few men thought themselves under any obligation to observe it, or made any scruple of eating blood. So that this rule of discipline is to be taken with this limitation and restriction as to what concerns the practice of the ancient Church. He that would see more about it may consult Curcellæus[48], who has written a large dissertation upon the subject.

16. For contemning the fasts and festivals of the Church.

21. The custom of the ancient Church was with a great deal of strictness to observe many stated fasts and festivals: as the annual fast of Lent, and the weekly fasts of the stationary-days, that is, Wednesday and Friday in every week, and the anniversary returns or commemorations of the great actions of our Saviour's life, and of his Apostles and Martyrs: and therefore some canons lay great penalties especially upon clergymen, who showed any disrespect to these by a wilful contempt or neglect of them. 'If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or

ἐπιχειροίη οἱῳδήτινι τρόπῳ, εἰ μὲν κληρικὸς εἴη, καθαιρείσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊδὸς, ἀφοριζέσθω.

[47] Cont. Faust. l. 32. c. 13. (t. 8. p. 457 a.) In Actibus Apostolorum hoc lege præceptum ab Apostolis, ut abstinerent gentes tantum a fornicatione et ab immolatis et a sanguine: id est, requidquam ederent carnis, cujus sanguis non esset effusus. Quod alii non sic intelligunt, sed a sanguine præceptum esse abstinendum, ne quis homicidio se contaminet. Hoc nunc discutere longum est, et non necessarium: quia et si hoc tunc Apostoli præceperunt, ut ab animalium sanguine abstinerent Christiani, ne præfocatis carnibus vescerentur, elegisse mihi videntur pro tempore rem facilem, et nequaquam observantibus onerosam, in qua cum Israëlitis etiam Gentes, propter angularem illum lapidem, duos [? parietes] in se condentem, aliquid communiter observarent; simul et admonerentur, in ipsa arca Noë, quando Deus hoc jussit, ecclesiam omnium gentium fuisse figuratam; cujus facti prophetia jam Gentibus, ad fidem accedentibus, incipiebat impleri. Transacto vero illo tempore, quo illi duo parietes, unus ex circumcisione alter ex præputio venientes, quamvis in angulari lapide concordarent, tamen suis quibusdam proprietatibus distinctius eminebant; ac ubi ecclesia Gentium talis effecta est, ut in ea nullus Israëlita carnalis appareat, quis jam hoc Christianus observat, ut turdos vel minutiores aviculas non attingat, nisi quarum sanguis effusus est; aut leporem non edat, si manu a cervice percussus, nullo cruento vulnere occisus est? Et, qui forte pauci adhuc tangere ista formidant, a cæteris irridentur: ita omnium animos in hac re tenuit illa sententia veritatis, *Non quod intrat in os vestrum vos coinquinat, sed quod exit;* nullam cibi naturam, quam societas admittit humana, sed quæ iniquitas committit peccata, condemnans.

[48] Diatriba de Esu Sanguinis, c. 13. (ap. Oper. Theolog. Amstel. 1675. fol. p. 974.) *The Title of the Chapter cited is,* Universæ Ecclesiæ Christianæ in improbando esu sanguinis Consensus.

reader, or singer,' says one of the Apostolical Canons[49], 'observe not the Lent-fast, or the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week, he shall be deposed, unless he be hindered by bodily weakness and infirmity.' The Council of Gangra[50] goes a little further, and denounces *anathema* to all the ascetics of the Church, who, without any plea of bodily necessity, out of mere pride and haughtiness, neglect and despise the fasts commonly received in the Church, and observed by ancient tradition. And another canon[51] denounces *anathema* likewise against all who accuse the assemblies made at the monuments of the martyrs, or abhor the service that is performed there, or despise the memorials or annual commemorations that were made in honour of them. A like canon was made in the first Council of Carthage[52], 'that if any one reproachfully said or did any thing to the dishonour of the martyrs; if he were a layman, he should be put under penance; but if he were a clergyman, after admonition and conviction, he should be deprived of his honour and dignity.' And some other canons were made by the Council of Laodicea[53] to the same purpose.

17. For not observing the rule about Easter.

22. Some canons also make it a great transgression not to observe the rule that was settled by the Church in the Council of Nice for fixing the time of keeping the Paschal festival. For though a great liberty was allowed before in this matter, by reason of the disputes that were between the Roman and Asiatic Churches about it; yet when once the great Council of Nice had interposed her authority to end the controversy,

[49] C. 69. [al. 68.] (Cotel. [c. 61.] v. 1. p. 446.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ἀναγνώστης, ἢ ψάλτης, τὴν ἁγίαν Τεσσαρακοστὴν [τοῦ Πάσχα], οὐ νηστεύει, ἢ Τετράδα, ἢ Παρασκευὴν, καθαιρείσθω· ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ δι' ἀσθένειαν σωματικὴν ἐμποδίζοιτο.

[50] C. 19. (t. 2. p. 424 b.) Εἴ τις ἀσκουμένων χωρὶς σωματικῆς ἀνάγκης ὑπερηφανεύοιτο, καὶ τὰς παραδεδομένας νηστείας εἰς τὸ κοινὸν, καὶ φυλασσομένας ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, παραλύοι, ἀποκυροῦντος ἐν αὐτῷ τελείου λογισμοῦ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[51] C. 20. (ibid. c.) Εἴ τις αἰτιῷτο ὑπερηφάνῳ διαθέσει κεχρημένος, καὶ βδελυσσόμενος τὰς συνάξεις τῶν μαρτύρων, ἢ τὰς ἐν αὐτοῖς γινομένας λειτουργίας, καὶ τὰς μνήμας αὐτῶν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[52] C. 2. (ibid. p. 714 e.) Si quis ad injuriam martyrum, claritati eorum adjungat infamiam, placet eos, si laici sint, ad pœnitentiam redigi: si autem sunt clerici, post commotionem et post cognitionem, honore privari.

[53] C. 34. (t. 1. p. 1501 e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ πάντα Χριστιανὸν ἐγκαταλείπειν μάρτυρας Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.—C. 35. (ibid. p. 1504 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἀπιέναι, καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν, καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν, κ. τ. λ. [See my note on this canon, cited before, b. 13. ch. 3. s. 3. v. 4. p. 337. n. 50. Ed.]

it was no longer esteemed a matter of indifferency; but all Churches were obliged to comply with her determination. Therefore the Council of Antioch not long after made a very peremptory decree[54], 'that whoever pertinaciously opposed the rule agreed upon in the Nicene Council, should be excommunicated and expelled the Church if he were a layman. And if either bishop, presbyter, or deacon should subvert the people and disturb the Church by keeping Easter in a different manner with the Jews, they should be removed from their ministry, and be cast out of the Church: and whoever communicated with them after such censure should be liable to the same condemnation.' There was also another way of celebrating Easter with the Jews, by a false calculation making it to fall before the vernal equinox, and so many times bringing two Easters into the same year. Which practice is condemned as Judaical by the author of the Constitutions[55], and any clergyman complying with it, by the Apostolical Canons[56], is made liable to deprivation also.

23. If any clergyman wore an indecent habit, unbecoming his order and station in the Church, he made himself liable to canonical censure. The first Council of Mascon[57] forbids

18. For wearing an indecent habit.

[54] C. 1. (t. 2. p. 561 a.) Πάντας τοὺς τολμῶντας παραλύειν τὸν ὅρον τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης συνόδου τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συγκροτηθείσης ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τῆς εὐσεβείας τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου, περὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἑορτῆς τοῦ σωτηριώδους Πάσχα, ἀκοινωνήτους καὶ ἀποβλήτους εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, εἰ ἐπιμένοιεν φιλονεικότερον ἐνιστάμενοι πρὸς τὰ καλῶς δεδογμένα· καὶ ταῦτα εἰρήσθω περὶ τῶν λαϊκῶν. Εἰ δέ τις τῶν προεστώτων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, μετὰ τὸν ὅρον τοῦτον τολμήσειεν ἐπὶ διαστροφῇ τῶν λαῶν, καὶ ταραχῇ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, ἰδιάζειν καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπιτελεῖν τὸ Πάσχα· τοῦτον ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη ἀλλότριον ἔκρινεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας· ὡς οὐ μόνον ἑαυτῷ ἁμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ πολλοῖς διαφθορᾶς καὶ διαστροφῆς γινόμενον αἴτιον· καὶ οὐ μόνον τοὺς τοιούτους καθαιρεῖ τῆς λειτουργίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς τολμῶντας τούτοις κοινωνεῖν μετὰ τὴν καθαίρεσιν· τοὺς δὲ καθαιρεθέντας ἀποστερεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς ἔξωθεν τιμῆς, ἧς ὁ ἅγιος κανὼν καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερατεῖον μετείληφεν.

[55] L. 5. c. 17. [al. 16.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 322.) Δεῖ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, τοὺς τῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τιμίῳ ἐξηγορασμένους αἵματι, τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ Πάσχα ἀκριβῶς ποιεῖσθαι, μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας, μετὰ τροπὴν ἐσημερινήν· ὅπως μὴ, δὶς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἑνὸς παθήματος μνείαν ποιεῖσθε, ἀλλὰ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους τοῦ ἅπαξ ἀποθανόντος. Μηκέτι δὲ παρατηρούμενοι μετὰ Ἰουδαίων ἑορτάζειν· οὐδεμία γὰρ κοινωνία ἡμῖν νῦν πρὸς αὐτούς· πεπλάνηνται γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ψῆφον, ἣν νομίζουσιν ἐπιτελεῖν· ὅπως πανταχόθεν ὅσι πεπλανημένοι, καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπεσχοινισμένοι.

[56] C. 7. [al. 8.] (Cotel. [c. 5.] v. 1. p. 437.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Πάσχα ἡμέραν πρὸ τῆς ἐαρινῆς ἐσημερίας μετὰ Ἰουδαίων ἐπιτελέσει, καθαιρείσθω.

[57] C. 5. (t. 5. p. 968 a.) Ut nullus

upon the stage, under the like penalty of deprivation. The Council of Laodicea[64] forbids them to be present as spectators at any stage-plays. And the Council of Carthage[65] gives a good reason why neither they nor their children ought either to exhibit or frequent such plays; 'because they were prohibited to laymen for the blasphemy of those wicked wretches that were concerned in them.' They thought it intolerable that any of the clergy should encourage those things by their presence which a layman could not see with innocence, nor be a spectator of without a censure.

20. For suspicious cohabitation with strange women.

25. The most ancient laws of the Church did not absolutely impose celibacy upon the clergy, nor universally restrain them from the conjugal state and married life, as has been shown more at large in a former Book[66]. But there were two things in the conversation of the clergy respecting women which they very much disallowed and censured. One was the suspicious and scandalous cohabitation of some vain and indiscreet men with strange women, who were none of their kindred. The freedom which these used obliged the Church not only to forbid the clergy to cohabit with such as they then termed *συνείσακτοι*, *foreigners and strangers*, in opposition to a mother, a sister, or an aunt, of whom for the nearness of blood there could be no reasonable suspicion; but also induced her to inforce this rule with the utmost severity of discipline upon delinquents. Cyprian[67] commends Pomponius for excommunicating a deacon who had been found guilty in this kind. And among other reasons alleged by the Council of Antioch for deposing Paulus Samosatensis from his bishopric, this is one[68], that he had always some of these *συνείσακτοι*, or *strange*

[64] C. 4. (t. 1. p. 1505 c.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικοὺς ἢ κληρικούς τινας θεωρίας θεωρεῖν ἐν γάμοις ἢ δείπνοις, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ εἰσέρχεσθαι τοὺς θυμελικούς, ἐγείρεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀναχωρεῖν.

[65] Carth. 3. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 1169 c.) Ut filii sacerdotum [al. episcoporum] vel clericorum spectacula sæcularia non exhibeant, sed nec spectent; quoniam a spectaculo et omnes laici prohibeantur. Semper enim Christianis omnibus hoc interdictum est, ut, ubi blasphemi sunt, non accedant.

[66] B. 4. ch. 5. s. 5, &c. v. 2. p. 67.

[67] Ep. 72. [al. 4.] (p. 174.).. Consulte et cum vigore fecisti... abstinendo diaconum, qui cum virgine sæpe mansit, sed et cæteros, qui cum virginibus dormire consueverunt.

[68] Vid. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 362. 19.) Τὰς δὲ συνεισάκτους αὐτοῦ γυναῖκας, ὡς Ἀντιοχεῖς ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων, οἷς καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἁμαρτήματα ἀνίατα ὄντα συγκρύπτει, συνειδὼς καὶ ἐλέγξας, ὅπως αὐτοὺς ὑπόχρεως ἔχῃ, περὶ ὧν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις ἀδικεῖ, μὴ τολμῶντας κατηγορεῖν τῷ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς φόβῳ.

women, to attend him, and allowed his presbyters and deacons to have the like, that they might not accuse him. The second Council of Arles[69] excommunicates every clergyman above the order of deacons that retains any woman as a companion, except it be a grandmother, or mother, or sister, or daughter, or niece, or a wife after her conversion. And the Council of Lerida[70] orders them to be suspended from their office till they amend their fault, after a first or second admonition.

21. For marrying after ordination.

26. The other thing that was generally disliked was the clergy's marrying a second time after ordination. They did not, as I said, reject married men from orders, nor oblige them to live separate from their wives after ordination: nay, if a deacon protested before ordination that he could not continue in an unmarried state, he might marry afterwards and not forfeit his office, by a decree[71] of the Council of Ancyra. But other canons forbid presbyters and bishops to marry after ordination, whether they were married or unmarried before, and this under pain of deprivation. 'If a presbyter marries a wife (that is, after he is ordained presbyter, for it regards not his being married before) let him be removed from his order,' says the Council of Neocæsarea[72]. The Council of Eliberis[73] and some others[74] in the Latin Church were more rigorous

[69] C. 3. (t. 4. p. 1011 d.) Si quis de clericis [al. clericus] a gradu diaconatus, in solatio suo mulierem, præter aviam, matrem, [sororem,] filiam, neptem, vel uxorem secum conversam, habere præsumpserit, alienus a communione habeatur.

[70] C. 15. (ibid. p. 1613 c.) Familiaritatem extranearum mulierum, licet ex toto sancti patres antiquis monitionibus præceperint ecclesiasticis evitandam, id nunc tamen nobis visum est, ut qui talis probabitur, si post primam et secundam commonitionem se emendare neglexerit, donec in vitio perseverat, officii sui dignitate privetur. Quod si se, Deo juvante, correxerit, sancto ministerio restauretur.

[71] C. 10. (t. 1. p. 1460 d.) *Διάκονοι, ὅσοι καθίστανται, παρ' αὐτὴν τὴν κατάστασιν εἰ ἐμαρτύραντο καὶ ἔφασαν χρῆναι γαμῆσαι, μὴ δυνάμενοι οὕτως μένειν· οὗτοι μετὰ ταῦτα γαμήσαντες, ἔστωσαν ἐν τῇ ὑπηρεσίᾳ, διὰ τὸ ἐπιτραπῆναι αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου· τοῦτο δὲ εἴ τινες σιωπήσαντες, καὶ καταδεξάμενοι ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ μένειν οὕτως, μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθον ἐπὶ γάμον, πεπαῦσθαι αὐτοὺς τῆς διακονίας.*

[72] C. 1. (ibid. p. 1480 e.) *Πρεσβύτερος ἐὰν γήμῃ, τῆς τάξεως αὐτὸν μετατίθεσθαι.*

[73] C. 33. (ibid. p. 974 c.) Placuit in totum prohiberi episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconibus, vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios: quicunque vero fecerit, ab honore clericatus exterminetur.

[74] C. Agathens. c. 9. (t. 4. p. 1384 d.) Placuit etiam ut, si diacones aut presbyteri conjugati ad torum uxorum suarum redire voluerint, Papæ Innocentii ordinatio et Siricii episcopi auctoritas, quæ est his canonibus inserta conservetur.

Epistola S. Innocentii Papæ.

Dilectissimo fratri Exuperio Innocentius.... Proposuisti, quid de

toward the married clergy, and began not only to forbid them to marry after ordination, but to oblige them to relinquish those wives they had married before. But as this was an encroachment upon the primitive rule, and never received in the Greek Church, it is not to be reckoned among the standing rules of discipline that concerned the whole Church.

22. For retaining an adulterous wife.

27. Yet there was one case in which the clergy were obliged to put away their wives, which was the case of adultery. 'If the wife of a layman,' says the Council of Neocæsarea[75], 'is convicted of adultery, such a one shall never attain to the ministry of the clergy. If she commits adultery after his ordination, he must put her away, or quit his ministry if he retains her.' The Council of Eliberis[76] goes a little further, and says,

his observari debeat, quos in diaconii ministerio, aut in officio presbyterii positos incontinentes esse aut fuisse, generati filii prodiderunt. De his et divinarum legum manifesta est disciplina, et beatæ recordationis viri Siricii episcopi monita evidentia commearunt, ut incontinentes in officiis talibus positi omni ecclesiastico honore privarentur, nec admitterentur accedere ad ministerium, quod sola continentia oportet impleri.... Nam si ad aliquos forma illa ecclesiasticæ vitæ pariter et disciplinæ, quæ a Siricio episcopo ad provincias commeavit, non probabitur pervenisse, his ignorationis venia remittetur; ita ut de cætero penitus incipiant abstinere. Et ita gradus suos in quibus inventi fuerint, sic retentent, ut ad potiora eis non liceat ascendere; quibus in beneficio esse debet, quod hunc ipsum locum, quem retinent, non amittunt. Si qui autem scisse formam vivendi missam a Siricio episcopo deteguntur, neque statim cupiditates libidinis abjecisse, illi sunt modis omnibus submovendi, qui post admonitionem cognitam præponendam arbitrari sunt voluptatem.—C. Arausic. 1. c. 13. (t. 3. p. 1459 e.) Si quis post acceptam benedictionem Leviticam cum uxore sua incontinens invenitur, ab officio abjiciatur.—C. Carth. 5. c. 3. (t. 2. p. 1215 e.) Cum de quorundam clericorum, quamvis erga uxores proprias, incontinentia referretur, placuit episcopos et presbyteros et diaconos, secundum propria [al. priora] statuta, etiam ab uxoribus continere. Quod nisi fecerint, ab ecclesiastico removeantur officio, &c.—C. Matiscon. 1. c. 11. (t. 5. p. 969 a.) Episcopi, presbyteri, vel universi honoratiores clerici, cum sublimi dignitatis apice sublimantur, actibus omnino renuntient sæculi, et, sacro electi ministerio, repudient carnale consortium, ac permixtionis pristinæ contubernium permutent germanitatis affectu. Et quisquis ille est, divino munere benedictione percepta, uxori prius suæ frater illico efficiatur ex conjuge. Eos vero, quos reperimus ardore libidinis inflammatos, abjecto religionis cingulo, ad vomitum pristinum et inhabita rursus conjugia repetisse, atque incesti quodammodo crimine clarum decus sacerdotii violasse, quod nati etiam filii prodiderunt: quod quisquis fecisse cognoscitur, omni in perpetuum, quam admisso jam crimine perdidit, dignitate privabitur.

[75] C. 8. (t. 1. p. 1481 d.) Γυνή τινος μοιχευθεῖσα λαϊκοῦ ὄντος, ἐὰν ἐλεγχθῇ φανερῶς, ὁ τοιοῦτος εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν ἐλθεῖν οὐ δύναται. Ἐὰν δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν χειροτονίαν μοιχευθῇ, ὀφείλει ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν· ἐὰν δὲ συζῇ, οὐ δύναται ἔχεσθαι τῆς ἐγχειρισθείσης αὐτῷ ὑπηρεσίας.

[76] C. 65. (ibid. p. 977 d.) Si cujus clerici uxor fuerit mœchata, et sciat [al. scierit] eam maritus suus mœchari, et eam non statim projecerit,

'If a clergyman's wife commits adultery, and the husband knows it, and does not immediately put her away, he shall not be admitted to communion even at his last hour; lest they, who should be an example of good conversation, should seem to teach others the way to sin.'

28. There were some laws also relating to the residence of the clergy, which was strictly enjoined, with a denunciation of canonical censures to the transgressors. The several laws requiring residence have been noted in another place[77]: here I shall only mention such of them as specify the punishments that were to be inflicted on offenders in this kind. Among these that canon of the Council of Agde is most remarkable, which decrees[78], that a presbyter or deacon who was absent from his church three weeks, should be three years suspended from the communion. And by the laws of Justinian[79] every bishop absenting from his Church beyond a certain term, and that upon very weighty affairs, and great necessity, or the will of his prince, is ordered to be removed from the college of bishops, as a man unworthy of his station. And the better to guard against this offence, as no clergyman was allowed to travel without the license and commendatory letters of his bishop; so neither might a bishop travel or appear at court without the license and approbation of his metropolitan. This was expressly provided by the same laws of Justinian[80], and before him by the third Council of Carthage[81], which orders, that no bishop shall go beyond sea without consulting his primate, or chief bishop of the province, and taking his *formatæ*, or *letters of commendation.* And before this the Council of

23. For non-residence.

nec in fine accipiat communionem: ne ab his, qui exemplum bonæ conversationis esse debent, videantur magisteria scelerum procedere.

[77] B. 6. ch. 4. s. 7. v. 2. p. 273.

[78] C. 64. (t. 4. p. 1393 e.) Si quis in clero constitutus ab ecclesia sua diebus solemnibus defuerit, id est, Nativitate, Epiphania, Pascha, vel Pentecoste, dum potius sæcularibus lucris studet, quam servitio Dei paret, convenit ut triennio a communione suspendatur. Similiter diaconus, vel presbyter, si tres hebdomadas ab ecclesia sua defuerint, huic damnationi succumbant.

[79] Novel. 6. c. 2. See b. 3. ch. 13. s. 6. v. 1. p. 365. n. 84.

[80] Ibid. c. 3. (t. 5. p. 55. ad calc.) Non autem aliter Deo aliquem amabilium episcoporum præsumere dirigere se ad hanc felicissimam civitatem, prius quam, si quidem quis episcopus sit, literas acceperit proprii metropolitæ ad imperium, &c.

[81] C. 28. (t. 2. p. 1171 c.) Placuit ut episcopi trans mare non proficiscantur, nisi consulto primæ sedis episcopo, sive cujuscunque provinciæ primate, ut ab episcopo præcipue possint sumere formatam sive commendationem.

Antioch made an order[82], 'that no bishop or presbyter, or any other belonging to the Church, should go to court upon any occasion to address the prince, without the consent and letters of the provincial bishops, and especially the metropolitan, under the penalty of being cast out of communion, and losing his honour and dignity in the Church.' And to this agree the rules and decrees of Pope Hilary[83] and of Gregory the Great[84], made in conformity to the ancient rules of discipline in the Church.

4. For attempting to hold preferment in two dioceses.

29. The clergy were further obliged to confine themselves to one church: that is, as I have formerly had occasion to explain it, one diocese or diocesan church, under the jurisdiction of one bishop; and not to seek or attempt to hold preferment under two bishops in two such distinct churches, or different jurisdictions. In this sense pluralities were forbidden under the penalty of deprivation. The Council of Chalcedon[85] is very express to this purpose: 'It shall not be lawful for any clergyman to have his name in the church-roll or catalogue of two cities at the same time, that is, in the church where he was first ordained, and any other to which he flies out of ambition as to a greater church; but all such shall be returned to their own church where they were first ordained, and only minister there. But if any is regularly removed from one

[82] C. 11. See s. 15. p. 67. n. 24.

[83] Ep. 8. ad Episcopos Galliæ. (CC. t. 4. p. 1043 a.) Illud etiam non possumus præterire, quod solicitudine diligentiore curandum sit, ne præter metropolitanorum suorum literas aliqui ad quamlibet provinciam audeant proficisci, quod etiam in omni genere officii clericalis per singulas debet ecclesias custodiri.

[84] L. 7. Ep. 8. (CC. t. 5. p. 1315 b.) Additur etiam quod ex vobis aliqui pro ecclesiæ suæ emergentibus causis transmarina petentes, sine prædicti metropolitani sui cognitione vel epistolis, sicut canonum ordo constituit, audeant ambulare. Hortamur ergo fraternitatem vestram, ut antiquam ecclesiarum vestrarum consuetudinem exsequentes, ... si quendam vestrum pro causis propriis ubicunque compulerit ambulare necessitas, ab eodem metropolitano vestro secundum indictam vobis regulam petere licentiam debeatis, nec eum postponere in aliquo præsumatis, &c.

[85] C. 10. (t. 4. p. 759 d.) Μὴ ἐξεῖναι κληρικὸν ἐν δύο πόλεων καταλέγεσθαι ἐκκλησίαις κατὰ τὸ αὐτό, ἐν ᾗ τε τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐχειροτονήθη, καὶ ἐν ᾗ προσέφυγεν, ὡς μείζονι δῆθεν, διὰ δόξης κενῆς ἐπιθυμίαν· τοὺς δέ γε τοῦτο ποιοῦντας ἀποκαθίστασθαι τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν ᾗ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐχειροτονήθησαν, καὶ ἐκεῖ μόνον λειτουργεῖν. Εἰ μέντοι ἤδη τις μετετέθη ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς ἄλλην ἐκκλησίαν, μηδὲν τοῖς τῆς προτέρας ἐκκλησίας, ἤτοι τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὴν μαρτυρίων, ἢ πτωχείων, ἢ ξενοδοχείων, ἐπικοινωνεῖν πράγμασι. Τοὺς δέ γε τολμῶντας μετὰ τὸν ὅρον τῆς μεγάλης καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς ταύτης συνόδου πράττειν τι τῶν νῦν ἀπηγορευμένων, ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος, ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ.

church to another, he shall not partake of the revenues of the former church, or of any oratory, hospital, or alms-house belonging to it. And such as shall presume, after this definition of this great and œcumenical council, to transgress in this matter, are condemned to be degraded by the holy synod.'

25. For needless frequenting of public inns and taverns.

30. The canons had also a great respect to the external and public behaviour of the clergy; obliging them to walk circumspectly, and abstain from things of ill fame, though otherwise innocent and indifferent in themselves; that they might cut off all occasions of obloquy, by avoiding all suspicious actions and all appearances of evil. In regard to which they not only censured them for rioting and drunkenness, which were vices not to be tolerated even in laymen; but forbad them so much as to eat or appear in a public inn or tavern, except they were upon a journey, or some such necessary occasion required them to do it, under pain of ecclesiastical censure. The Council of Laodicea[86] and the third Council of Carthage[87] forbid it universally to all orders of the clergy; and the Apostolical Canons[88] more expressly, with a denunciation of censure, viz. an *ἀφορισμὸς*, *excommunication* or *suspension* from their office, to any that should be found in a tavern, except they were upon a journey, and the necessity of their affairs required it.

26. For conversing familiarly with Jews, heretics, or Gentile philosophers.

31. For the same reason the canons prohibited them conversing familiarly with Jews, heretics and Heathens, especially the Gentile philosophers, because of the scandal attending such communication. The laws forbidding all communication with Jews and heretics have been mentioned upon another occasion[89]: I shall here only add that remarkable story which Sozomen[90] tells of Theodotus, bishop of Laodicea in Syria,

[86] C. 24. (t. 1. p. 1501 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικοὺς ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων ἕως διακόνων, καὶ ἑξῆς τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς τάξεως ἕως ὑπηρετῶν, ἢ ἀναγνωστῶν, ἢ ψαλτῶν, ἢ ἐπορκιστῶν, ἢ θυρωρῶν, ἢ τοῦ τάγματος τῶν ἀσκητῶν, εἰς καπηλεῖον εἰσιέναι.

[87] C. 27. (t. 2. p. 1171 b.) Ut clerici, edendi vel bibendi causa, tabernas non ingrediantur, nisi peregrinationis necessitate compulsi.

[88] C. 53. [al. 54.] (Cotel. [c. 46.] v. 1. p. 445.) Εἴ τις κληρικὸς ἐν καπηλείῳ φωραθείη ἐσθίων, ἀφοριζέσθω· παρὲξ τοῦ ἐν πανδοχείῳ ἐν ὁδῷ δι' ἀνάγκην καταλύειν [al. καταλύοντος vel καταλύσαντος].

[89] B. 16. ch. 6. ss. 3 and 10. v. 6. pp. 274 and 295.

[90] L. 6. c. 25. (v. 2. p. 251. 15.) Ἔτι γὰρ Θεοδότου τοῦ πρὸ αὐτοῦ τὴν Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίαν ἰθύναντος, κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ διαπρέπων Ἐπιφάνιος, ὁ σοφιστής, ὕμνον εἰς τὸν Διόνυσον παρῄει· διδασκάλῳ δὲ αὐτῷ χρώμενος Ἀπολλινάριος, ἔτι γὰρ νέος ἦν, παρε-

'how he excommunicated the two Apollinarii, father and son, because they went to hear Epiphanius the sophist speak his hymn in the praise of Bacchus;' which was a thing so disagreeable to their character, the one being a presbyter, the other a deacon in the Christian Church.

27. For using over rigorous severity towards lapsers.

32. As clergymen were obliged to show a just severity to impenitent sinners, by putting the laws of discipline duly in execution against them: so on the other hand an over rigorous severity and stiffness in refusing to receive and reconcile penitent lapsers, after they had made canonical satisfaction, was a great offence, and such a manifest abuse of the ministerial power, as the Church thought fit to correct with some sharpness in her clergy. If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon,' say the Apostolical Canons[91]; 'receives not one that turns from sin, but casts him out, let him be deposed: because he grieves Christ, who said, "There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth."' This was not the true exercise of discipline, but imperiousness and humour, and a mere domineering over God's heritage by an exorbitant stretch of the ministerial power. It was the very thing which the Novatian heretics contended for, and what the Church always opposed and condemned in them: and therefore when any of her own clergy assumed to themselves this extravagant power, she justly esteemed them infected with this Novatian principle of cruelty, and as such made them liable to the sentence of deprivation.

28. For want of charity to indigent clerks.

33. There was another sort of cruelty which the Church also much resented in any of her clergy; which was want of charity to any that were indigent and distressed in their own order. As charity obliges men to do good to all, as they have opportunity, but more especially to those who are of the house-

γένετο τῇ ἀκροάσει σὺν τῷ πατρί· ὁμώνυμος δὲ ἦν αὐτῷ, γραμματικὸς οὐκ ἄσημος. Ἐπεὶ δὲ τοῦ λόγου ἀρχόμενος Ἐπιφάνιος, ὡς ἔθος τοῖς τοιάδε ἐπιδεικνυμένοις λέγειν, τοὺς ἀμνήτους καὶ βεβήλους ἐξιέναι θύραζε ἐκέλευεν· οὔτε δὲ Ἀπολλιάριος ὁ νέος, οὔτε ὁ πρεσβύτης, οὔτε ἕτερός τις τῶν παρόντων Χριστιανῶν τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἀπεχώρησε. Μαθὼν ταῦτα Θεόδοτος, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, χαλεπῶς ἤνεγκε· καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἐν λαῷ τεταγμένοις μετρίως ἐγκαλέσας συγγνώμην ἔνειμεν· Ἀπολλιαρίῳ δὲ .. ἐλέγξας τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀφώρισεν· ἤστην γὰρ κληρικώ· ὁ μὲν πατὴρ, πρεσβύτερος· ὁ δὲ παῖς, ἀναγνώστης ἔτι τῶν ἱερῶν Γραφῶν.

[91] C. 52. [al. 51.] (Cotel. [c. 44.] ibid. p. 445.) *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, τὸν ἐπιστρέφοντα ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας οὐ προσδέχεται, ἀλλ' ἀποβάλλεται, καθαιρείσθω· ὅτι λυπεῖ τὸν Χριστὸν, εἰπόντα, Χαρὰ γίνεται ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι.*

hold of faith: so clergymen were more especially obliged to assist those, who were joined with them in the same ministry, and united more closely by a stricter bond of fraternity in the same occupation and employment. Therefore the Apostolical Canons[92] censure this as a great transgression in these very sharp terms: 'If any bishop or presbyter refuse to give necessaries to any clergyman that is in want, let him be cast out of communion: and if he persist, let him be deposed, as a murderer of his brother.'

29. For judging in cases of blood.

34. It was thought also some sort of cruelty, at least a very improper and unbecoming thing, for any clergyman to be concerned in judging or giving sentence in cases of blood. The laws allowed them to be chosen arbitrators of men's differences in civil causes: but they had no power at all in criminal causes, except such as were purely ecclesiastical; and least of all in such criminal causes where life and death was concerned. Therefore there are many canons forbidding this under the penalty of the highest censure of deprivation. The Council of Tarragona[93] universally forbids the clergy to sit as judges in any civil criminal causes. The Council of Auxerre[94] more particularly enjoins presbyters not to sit in judgment when any man is to be condemned to die; and in another canon[95] forbids both presbyters and deacons to stand at the *Trepalium*, where criminals were put to the rack and examined by torture. The fourth Council of Toledo[96] allows not priests to sit as judges in cases of treason, even at the command of the prince, except the prince promised beforehand upon oath, that he would pardon the offence, and remit the punishment. If they did otherwise, they were to be held guilty of bloodshed before Christ, and to lose their order and degree in the Church. The eleventh

[92] C. 59. [al. 58. (Cotel. [c. 51.] ibid.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπως, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, τινὸς τῶν κληρικῶν ἐνδεοῦς ὄντος, μὴ ἐπιχορηγεῖ τὰ δέοντα, ἀφοριζέσθω· ἐπιμένων δὲ, καθαιρείσθω, ὡς φονεύσας τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.

[93] C. 4. (t. 4. p. 1654 b.)... Habeant licentiam judicandi, exceptis criminalibus negotiis.

[94] C. 34. (t. 5. p. 960 d.) Non licet presbytero in illo judicio sedere, unde homo ad mortem tradatur.

[95] C. 33. (ibid. c.) Non licet presbytero nec diacono ad Trepalium, ubi rei torquentur, stare.

[96] C. 30. [al. 31.] (t. 5. p. 1714 d.) Ibi consentiant regibus fieri judices, ubi jurejurando, supplicii indulgentia promittitur; non ubi discriminis [al. sanguinis] sententia præparatur. Si quis ergo sacerdotum discussor in alienis periculis exstiterit, sit reus effusi sanguinis apud Christum, et apud ecclesiam perdat proprium gradum.

canonical censure for his tameness in not correcting them for their presumption.

3. For dividing their diocese, and erecting new bishoprics without leave: or extending their claims to other men's rights beyond their own limits and jurisdictions.

37. Bishops rendered themselves obnoxious to canonical censure, if they made any attempts to alter the boundaries or districts of the Church, settled by ancient law and custom without the advice and consent of a provincial synod. Dioceses might be divided upon just reasons, and new ones be erected out of them: either when they were too large for one bishop's care: which made St. Austin divide the diocese of Hippo, and take the new bishopric of Fussala[5] out of it: or else when the prince thought fit to advance some eminent town or village into a city, then that city might be made a new bishopric by the consent of a provincial council. But if any one ambitiously got himself ordained bishop of a village, where there never had been any bishop before, or as ambitiously solicited the prince to turn a village into a city, that he might be made the bishop of it; in such cases the Church thought fit to correct the lofty thoughts of aspiring men, and defeat their attempts, by denying them those honours they had taken such indirect methods to obtain, and putting them under the censure of a deprivation. There are many canons and rules of discipline which forbid this practice: but the rule made in one of the Councils of Toledo is most remarkable, being an inference made upon a special case from all the ancient canons, (forbidding bishops to be ordained in villages,) which are there recited. King Wamba by an imperious mandate had enjoined some bishops to ordain other bishops in several villages and monasteries, lying in the suburbs of Toledo and other places. Against which innovating attempt and usurpation the Council first cites the ancient canons, and then concludes with a new decree in these words[6]: 'If any one shall offer to go against

c. 8. (CC. [cc. 6, 7.] t. 4. p. 1189 e.) Nec minus etiam presbyteros ultra modum suum tendere prohibemus: nec episcopali fastigio debita sibimet audacter assumere.... Si quidquam ad episcopale ministerium specialiter pertinens suo motu putaverint exsequendum, continuo se presbyterii dignitate et sacra communione privari. Quod fieri necesse est censeamus, si, eorum præsule deferente, hujusmodi fuerit prævaricatio comprobata, nec ipso eorum episcopo a culpa conniventiæ et ultione vacaturo, si immoderata facientem dissimulaverit vindicare.... Diaconos quoque propriam constituimus servare mensuram, etc.

[5] See before, b. 9. ch. 2. s. 5. v. 3. p. 258.

[6] Tolet. 12. c. 4. (t. 6. p. 1229 e.) .... Si quis contra hæc canonum interdicta venire conatus fuerit [al. conaverit], ut in locis illis [se] epi-

the prescription of these canons, in procuring himself to be made a bishop in those places, where there never was any bishop before, let him be *anathema* in the sight of God Almighty. And let moreover both the ordainer and the ordained lose the degree of their order, because they attempt not only to infringe the decrees of the ancient fathers, but the institutions of the Apostles.' The Council of Chalcedon made a like decree[7] against any that should presume to address the higher powers to get a province divided into two, in order to erect a new metropolis in it. This, they say, was against the rule of the Church, and therefore they denounce the deprivation against any one that should attempt it.

4. For not attending provincial councils.

38. Bishops were obliged to attend provincial councils; and if they refused or neglected to do this without a reasonable cause, they were liable to suspension. To this purpose there is a decree in the second Council of Arles[8]: 'If any one neglects to be present, or leaves the assembly of his brethren, before the council be ended, he shall be excluded from the communion of his brethren, and not be received again till he is absolved by the following synod.' The same decree is repeated by the Council of Tarragona[9], and said to be conformable to the rules of the fathers, 'that if any bishop contemptuously omit to come to synod, when he is called by his metropolitan, unless he be under some great bodily infirmity, he shall be deprived of the communion of all the bishops to the sitting of the next Council;' which the African Synods[10] call, 'being content with the communion of his own church only.'

scopum eligat fieri, ubi episcopus nunquam fuit, [anathema] sit in conspectu Dei Omnipotentis. Et insuper tam ordinator [al. ordinans] quam ordinatus gradum sui ordinis perdat: quia non solum antiquorum patrum decreta, sed et apostolica ausus est convellere instituta.

[7] C. 12. (t. 4. p. 762 b.) Ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὥς τινες παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς προσδραμόντες δυναστείαις, διὰ πραγματικῶν βασιλικῶν, τὴν μίαν ἐπαρχίαν εἰς δύο κατέτεμον, ὡς ἐκ τούτου δύο μητροπολίτας εἶναι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ· ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος, τοῦ λοιποῦ μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τολμᾶσθαι παρὰ ἐπισκόπῳ· ἐπεὶ τὸν τούτῳ ἐπιχειροῦντα ἐκπίπτειν τοῦ οἰκείου βαθμοῦ.

[8] C. 19. (ibid. p. 1013 c.) Si quis autem adesse neglexerit, aut cœtum fratrum, antequam dissolvatur concilium, crediderit deserendum, alienum se a fratrum communione cognoscat, nec eum recipi liceat, nisi in sequenti synodo fuerit absolutus.

[9] C. 6. (ibid. p. 1564 c.) Si quis episcoporum [al. episcopus], commonitus a metropolitano, ad synodum, nulla gravi intercedente necessitate corporali, venire contempserit, sicut statuta patrum censuerunt, usque ad futurum concilium cunctorum episcoporum caritatis communione privetur.

[10] C. Carth. 5. c. 10. (t. 2. p. 1217

5. For oppressing the people with unjust exactions.

39. If any bishop oppressed his people, or any part of them, with hard usage, unjust demands, or unreasonable exactions; it was peculiarly provided in this case by the laws of the African Church, that he should be amerced or punished with the loss of that part of his diocese or people who had reason to complain of such oppression. I have already noted this, in the last chapter, out of one of St. Austin's Epistles[11], where he neatly defends this way of proceeding with bishops, when their offences were neither so great as to deserve deprivation, nor so small as to be perfectly overlooked or let wholly pass without a censure.

6. For harbouring such as fled from another diocese without leave.

40. Finally, whereas it was provided by the canons, that no bishop should harbour or encourage any clerk flying from his own diocese, nor any monk deserting his own monastery, some Councils took care to prevent this abuse, not only by degrading the deserting clerk, but by inflicting canonical punishment upon the bishop that so countenanced or received him. The Council of Antioch[12] leaves it in general to the synod to punish such an offending bishop. The Apostolical Canons[13] are more particular, 'that he shall be suspended from his office, as a master of disorder.' But in Afric[14] they had a more peculiar sort of punishment for such a bishop, which was, 'that he should communicate with no other bishop of the province, but be content with the communion of his own church:' which, as has been observed, was a moderate punishment for offences

b.) Quod si non potuerint occurrere excusationes suas in tractatoria subscribant: vel si post adventum tractatoriæ aliquæ necessitates repente forsitan ortæ fuerint, nisi rationem impedimenti sui apud suum primatem reddiderint, ab ecclesiæ communione debere esse contemptos. [Al. ecclesiæ suæ communione debere esse contentos. Vid. Crabb. (t. 1. p. 446.) in margin. ad loc. Conf. etiam Cod. Afric. 76. (ibid. p. 1095 b.) Εἰ μὴ τὸν λόγον τοῦ οἰκείου ἐμποδισμοῦ παρὰ τῷ οἰκείῳ πρωτεύοντι ἀποδώσωσιν, ὀφείλειν τοὺς τοιούτους τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς ἰδίας αὐτῶν ἀρκεῖσθαι ἐκκλησίας. See also n. 14, following. Ed.]

[11] Ep. 261. See before, ch. 4. s. 4. p. 36. n. 15.

[12] C. 3. (t. 2. p. 564 b.) Εἰ δὲ καθαιρεθέντα διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν δέχοιτο ἕτερος ἐπίσκοπος, κἀκεῖνον ἐπιτιμίας τυγχάνειν ὑπὸ κοινῆς συνόδου, ὡς παραλύοντα τοὺς θεσμοὺς τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικούς.

[13] C. 16. [al. 15.] (Cotel. [c. 15.] v. 1. p. 439.) Εἰ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, παρ' ᾧ τυγχάνουσι, παρ' οὐδὲν λογισάμενος τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν ὁρισθεῖσαν ἀργίαν, δέξεται αὐτοὺς ὡς κληρικοὺς, ἀφοριζέσθω ὡς διδάσκαλος ἀταξίας.

[14] C. Carth. 5. c. 13. (t. 2. p. 1217 e.) Placuit, ut si quis de alterius monasterio repertum, vel ad clericatum promovere voluerit, vel in suo monasterio majorem monasterii constituere; episcopus, qui hoc fecerit, a cæterorum communione sejunctus, suæ tantum plebis communione contentus sit: et ille neque clericus, neque præpositus perseveret.

of a lower rate, which neither deserved to be punished with deprivation, nor yet escape wholly unpunished as no offences.

Chorepiscopi might be censured for acting beyond their commission.

41. Next to the bishops there were a sort of ecclesiastical persons, whom the ancient Church called *chorepiscopi*, or *country-bishops*, because they officiated in certain episcopal duties under the city-bishop in country-districts. These acted by a limited and dependent power, but many times were inclined to assume a power to themselves beyond their commission: therefore the Church was obliged to make certain laws and rules to restrain and correct their usurpations. These might ordain the inferior clergy, subdeacons, readers, and exorcists by a general commission, but not presbyters or deacons without a specal license: yet sometimes they would take upon them to do that also without consulting the city-bishop; for which offence they were liable by the Canons[15] to lose their office and be degraded.

And presbyters for usurping upon the episcopal office.

42. The like may be observed of presbyters, who were assistants to bishops in performing their office, but with certain limitations, that they should not meddle with such parts of it as they reserved absolutely to themselves; such as ordination and consecration of chrism, for the use of confirming, and the consecration of churches and altars. And if presbyters at any time exceeded the limits of their commission and order, by assuming the exercise and power of these things to themselves, by the laws of the Church they were liable to be divested of their ordinary power, which otherwise they might have enjoyed, and made subject to the penalty of a total deprivation. Thus when Eutychianus and Musæus, who were no bishops, had ordained several clerks, the Council of Sardica[16] ordered, that

[15] Vid. C. Antioch. c. 10. (ibid. p. 565 c.) Τοὺς ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, ἢ ταῖς χώραις, ἢ τοὺς καλουμένους χωρεπισκόπους, εἰ καὶ χειροθεσίαν εἶεν ἐπισκόπων εἰληφότες, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ εἰδέναι τὰ ἑαυτῶν μέτρα, καὶ διοικεῖν τὰς ὑποκειμένας αὐτοῖς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι φροντίδι καὶ κηδεμονίᾳ, καθιστᾶν δὲ ἀναγνώστας, καὶ ὑποδιακόνους, καὶ ἐφορκιστὰς, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι προαγωγῇ· μήτε πρεσβύτερον, μήτε διάκονον χειροτονεῖν τολμᾶν, δίχα τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, ᾗ ὑπόκειται αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ χώρα· εἰ δὲ τολμήσειέ τις παραβῆναι τὰ ὁρισθέντα, καθαιρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἧς μετέχει τιμῆς.

[16] C. 20. (ibid. p. 641 d.) Ὅσιος ἐπίσκοπος εἶπε· Τῆς ἐμῆς μετριότητος ἡ ἀπόφασίς ἐστιν αὕτη· ἐπειδὰν ἥσυχοι καὶ ὑπομονητικοὶ ὀφείλομεν εἶναι, καὶ διαρκῆ τὸν πρὸς πάντας ἔχειν οἶκτον, ἅπαξ τοὺς εἰς κλῆρον ἐκκλησιαστικὸν προαχθέντας ὑπό τινων ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ βούλοιντο ἐπανέρχεσθαι εἰς ἃς κατωνομάσθησαν ἐκκλησίας, τοῦ λοιποῦ μὴ ὑποδέχεσθαι· Εὐτυχιανὸν δὲ μήτε ἐπισκόπου ἑαυτῷ

for this presumption they should be deprived of their orders, and entirely reduced to the communion of laymen. And in the first Council of Braga a decree[17] was made, prohibiting presbyters either to consecrate the chrism, or churches, or altars, under pain of deposition from their office: because the ancient canons always forbid it.

And deacons for assuming offices and privileges above their order and station.

43. Deacons likewise were confined to certain offices and stations appropriated to their order; above which if they presumed ambitiously to aspire, and thrust themselves into the presbyter's duty, or any ways insult them; they also incurred the highest censures. The Council of Nice[18] takes notice of some such usurpations and abuses committed by deacons; that in some places the deacons took upon them to distribute the sacrament to presbyters, and to receive it before bishops themselves, and to sit in the midst of the presbyters; which being contrary both to rule and custom, it is ordered 'that such assuming deacons should be suspended,' or *cease from their ministry*, as the words *πεπαύσθω τῆς διακονίας* seem rather to signify. The second Council of Arles has a canon[19] to the same purpose, 'that deacons shall not sit in the *secretarium* or *vestry* among the presbyters; nor presume to deliver the body of Christ, when a presbyter is present. If they do, they shall cease to officiate any longer as deacons.'

διεκδικεῖν ὄνομα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Μουσαῖον ὡς ἐπίσκοπον νομίζεσθαι· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὴν κοινωνίαν ἀπαιτοῖεν, μὴ χρῆναι αὐτοῖς ἀρνεῖσθαι. Πάντες εἶπον, Ἀρέσκει.

[17] C. 37. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 19.] (t. 5. p. 842 b.) Si quis presbyter post hoc interdictum ausus fuerit chrisma benedicere, aut ecclesiam aut altare consecrare, a suo officio deponatur. Nam et antiqui canones hoc vetuerunt.

[18] C. 18. (t. 2. p. 244 d.) *Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην σύνοδον, ὅτι ἔν τισι τόποις καὶ πόλεσι, πρεσβυτέροις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οἱ διάκονοι διδόασιν· ὅπερ οὔτε ὁ κανὼν οὔτε ἡ συνήθεια παρέδωκε, τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, τούτοις τοῖς προσφέρουσι διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· κἀκεῖνο δὲ ἐγνωρίσθη, ὅτι ἤδη τινὲς τῶν διακόνων καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἅπτονται. Ταῦτα οὖν ἅπαντα περιῃρήσθω· καὶ ἐμμενέτωσαν οἱ διάκονοι τοῖς ἰδίοις μέτροις, εἰδότες ὅτι τοῦ μὲν ἐπισκόπου ὑπηρέται εἰσὶ, τῶν δὲ πρεσβυτέρων ἐλάττους τυγχάνουσι. Λαμβανέτωσαν δὲ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν μετὰ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, ἢ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου διδόντος αὐτοῖς ἢ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου. Ἀλλὰ μηδὲ καθῆσθαι ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐξέστω τοῖς διακόνοις· παρὰ κανόνα γὰρ καὶ παρὰ τάξιν ἐστὶ τὸ γινόμενον· εἰ δέ τις μὴ θέλοι πειθαρχεῖν καὶ μετὰ τούτους τοὺς ὅρους, πεπαύσθω τῆς διακονίας.*

[19] C. 15. (t. 4. p. 1013 a.) In secretario diaconos inter presbyteros sedere non liceat: vel corpus Christi, præsente presbytero, tradere non præsumant. Quod si fecerint, ab officio diaconatus abscedant.

Thus every order among the clergy had their particular offices assigned them; and not only neglects and omissions of their duty, but intermeddling with offices that did not belong to them, and assuming powers that were foreign to their order, was a sufficient cause of suspension or deprivation. And so I have done with what relates more peculiarly to the discipline of the Clergy.

BOOK XVIII.

OF THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF PENITENTS, AND THE METHOD OF DOING PUBLIC PENANCE IN THE CHURCH BY GOING THROUGH THE SEVERAL STAGES OF REPENTANCE.

CHAP. I.

Of the several orders of penitents in the Church.

Penitents divided into four orders or classes.

1. We have hitherto considered the discipline of the Church as exercised upon obstinate and notorious criminals, in order to bring them to repentance: we are now to examine it again in its progress, as exercised upon penitents, who submitted to the rules of discipline, and see how they were treated in the performance of their penance, from the time of their excommunication to the time of their admission into the Church again.

The performance of penance anciently was a matter of considerable length and time, to examine men's behaviour and sincerity, and make them give just testimony and evidence of real sorrow and hearty abhorrence of their sins, to satisfy the Church that they were sincere converts, by submitting to go through a long course of penance, according as the wisdom of the Church thought fit to impose it upon them. And upon this account the Church was used to divide her penitents into *four distinct ranks or classes of different degrees*, called by the Greeks, προσκλαίοντες, ἀκροώμενοι, ὑποπίπτοντες, and συνιστάμενοι; and by the Latins, *flentes, audientes, substrati*, and *consistentes;* that is, *the mourners* or *weepers, the hearers, the substrators*, and *the co-standers;* the meaning of which names and distinctions shall be explained by and by.

Some add to these *a fifth order*, but without any just ground or reason for it. Bellarmin[1] says, 'there was a fifth place, of such penitents as had fully completed their penance, and only waited for the time of reconciliation. And the place of these penitents,' he says, 'was called *μέστωσις*, or *the completion*.' Our learned Dr. Cave[2] also slides unwarily into the same mistake, making five orders of penitents, whereof the fifth and last, he says, were called *communicantes*, and were admitted to the participation of the holy sacrament. But it is most certain, there never was any such order of penitents, under the name of *communicants*, or *partakers of the holy sacrament*, acknowledged in the Church. For *communicants*, absolutely so called as denoting *partakers of the eucharist*, are everywhere distinguished from the penitents, and go by other names; *πίστοι, τέλειοι*, &c, *the faithful, the perfect;* that is, persons not under discipline and public penance, which is an imperfect state of communion, but in the perfect, peaceable, and full communion of the Church: none of which ever go by the name of *penitents* in any ancient writer. Some penitents indeed are said to communicate imperfectly with the Church in some one particular thing; as the fourth order of penitents, called *costanders*, are said often 'to communicate in prayers without the oblation or eucharist:' but these, as they did not partake of the eucharist, so neither were they ever reputed perfect communicants in the Church, till they were restored to the *τὸ τέλειον, the complete communion* of the faithful at the altar. So that there is no manner of ground for this fifth order of penitents, the invention of which is entirely owing to a mistake, and implies a contradiction.

The first original of this distinction.

2. As to the other four orders of penitents, it is generally agreed among learned men, that the Church observed such a distinction; but *how early* is not indisputably certain. Cardinal Bona[3] thinks, the distinction of penitential classes was first made about the time of the Novatian schism; that is, about

[1] De Pœnitent. l. 1. c. 22. t. 3. p. 959. (t. 3. p. 1052 c.) Quintus locus eorum erat, qui jam pœnitentiam expleverant, et solum expectabant tempus reconciliationis: non enim reconciliabantur pœnitentes solemni cærimonia, nisi feria quinta in cœna Domini ... Dicebatur locus horum pœnitentium *μέστωσις*, id est, *expletio*.

[2] Primitive Christianity, part 1. ch. 8. p. 217. (p. 104.) The next sort were the penitents, &c.

[3] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 17. n. 3. (p. 213.) Observant eruditi in scriptis Tertulliani, Cypriani, et aliorum

the middle of the third century. And Suicerus[4], speaking of the order of penitents called *hearers*, says, 'there is no mention made of it before the time of Novatus; though otherwise a place for hearing the Scriptures and sermon was allowed in the church for Heathens, Jews, heretics, schismatics, and the second rank of the catechumens, who upon that account were commonly termed *hearers*, long before the name was given to any sort of penitents as a distinct order.'

Of the *flentes* or *mourners*.

3. But, in the third and fourth century, we commonly find the penitents distinguished into four orders: the first of which were the *flentes*, or *mourners*; who were rather candidates for penance, than penitents strictly speaking. Their station was in the church-porch, where they lay prostrate, begging the prayers of the faithful as they went in, and desiring to be admitted to do public penance in the church. This is what Tertullian means, when he says[5], 'they were used to fall down at the presbyter's feet, and kneel to the friends of God, and entreat all the brethren to recommend their petition, and intercede with heaven for them.' And so the historian[6] represents the practice of Ecebolius, the sophist, who having apostatized

Patrum, qui ducentis et quinquaginta annis post Christum floruerunt, nullam reperiri pœnitentium in varias classes distinctionem; sive episcoporum prudentiæ commissa tunc fuerit, sive revera post Novati hæresin inceperit, quod probabilius existimo, etc.

[4] Thes. Eccles. voce Ἀκρόασις. (t. 1. p. 171.) Secundus pœnitentium gradus, seu ἐπιτιμίων τόπος, vocatur ἀκρόασις.... Hæc statio sex hominum genera complectebatur; (teste Morino de Administrat. Pœnit. l. 6. c. 4.) Ethnicos, Judæos, Hæreticos, Schismaticos, primi generis Catechumenos, et Audientes Pœnitentes: his enim omnibus, cum ad ecclesiam sese conferebant, hic locus assignabatur, iisque omnibus Psalmorum cantum, sacræ Scripturæ lectionem, et sermones episcoporum audire licebat: neminem enim ab horum auscultatione prohibebant. Ante exortam Novati hæresin nunquam usurpata legitur hæc statio.—Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 16. (CC. t. 1. p. 241 a.) Ἰδὼν δὲ σὺ, κ. τ. λ.

[5] De Pœnitent. c. 9. See b. 1. ch. 4. s. 4. v. 1. p. 32. n. 63.—Vid. Libr. de Pudicit. c. 13. (p. 564 c.) Et tu quidem, pœnitentiam mœchi ad exorandam fraternitatem in ecclesiam inducens, conciliatum et concineratum, cum dedecore et horrore compositum, prosternis in medium ante viduas, ante presbyteros, omnium lacinias invadentem [al. lacrymas suadentem], omnium vestigia lambentem, omnium genua detinentem, etc. [Instead of *conciliatum, reconciled*, may not *conciliciatum, covered with sackcloth*, be the true reading, especially in connection with *concineratum, covered with ashes?* See afterwards, ch. 2. s. 2. p. 103. Ed.]

[6] Socrat. l. 3. c. 13. (v. 2. p. 188. 24.) ..... Ὅστις [Ἐκηβόλιος] τοῖς ἤθεσι τῶν βασιλέων ἑπόμενος, ἐπὶ μὲν Κωνσταντίου διαπύρως χριστιανίζειν ὑπεκρίνατο· ἐπὶ δὲ Ἰουλιανοῦ, γοργὸς Ἕλλην ἐφαίνετο· καὶ αὖθις μετὰ Ἰουλιανὸν, χριστιανίζειν ἤθελε· ῥίψας γὰρ ἑαυτὸν πρηνῆ πρὸ τῆς πύλης τοῦ εὐκτηρίου οἴκου, Πατήσατέ με, ἐβόα, τὸ ἅλας τὸ ἀναίσθητον.

under Julian, desired to make his recantation, and do penance under Jovian: the first step toward which was, that he cast himself prostrate to the earth before the gate of the church, crying out, *Calcate me insipidum salem: Tread me under foot as salt without savour.* Some Canons[7] pass over this act as only a preliminary to repentance: but Gregory Thaumaturgus and St. Basil expressly mention it in their Canons. Gregory[8] says: 'The place of the mourners is without the gate of the church, where the sinner must stand, and beg the prayers of the faithful as they enter in.' And St. Basil[9] thus describes the four stations of penitents: 'The first year they are to weep before the gate of the church; the second year, to be admitted to hearing; the third year, to genuflexion, or repentance properly so called; and the fourth year, to stand with the faithful at prayers without partaking of the oblation.' And in this sense we may understand that passage in St. Ambrose[10], where, speaking to one that had corrupted a virgin, he tells him, 'his only method now was to implore the help of the saints, (meaning, not saints in heaven, but saints on earth in the church,) and to cast himself at the feet of the elect;' which seems plainly to allude to this custom. In like manner Eusebius[11], describing the behaviour of Natalis, the confessor, upon his return to the Church from the Theodosian heretics, who had allured him by great rewards to become bishop of their party, says, 'he came in sackcloth and ashes, and with tears cast himself at the feet of Zephyrinus, then bishop of Rome;

[7] C. Nicæn. cc. 11, 12. (t. 2. p. 33 d, e.) Περὶ τῶν παραβαινόντων, κ.τ.λ. —C. Ancyr. cc. 4, 6, 9. (t. 1. p. 1457 c, e. et p. 1460 c.) Περὶ τῶν πρὸς βίαν θυσάντων, κ. τ. λ.

[8] Ep. Canonic. c. 11. (CC. t. 1. p. 841 c.) Ἡ πρόσκλαυσις ἔξω τῆς πύλης τοῦ εὐκτηρίου ἐστὶν, ἔνθα ἑστῶτα τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα, χρὴ τῶν εἰσιόντων δεῖσθαι πιστῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ εὔχεσθαι.

[9] C. 22. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 199. Canonic. Secund.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1736 d.) Χρὴ δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ ἐκβάλλεσθαι τῶν προσευχῶν, καὶ προσκλαίειν αὐτοὺς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας· τῷ δευτέρῳ δεχθῆναι εἰς ἀκρόασιν· τῷ τρίτῳ εἰς μετάνοιαν· τῷ τετάρτῳ εἰς σύστασιν μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀπεχομένους τῆς προσφορᾶς.—Conf. cc. 56, 57, 58, 59, 64, 66, 75. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 217. Canonic. Tert.] (CC. ibid. p. 1748 d, seqq.)

[10] Ad Virg. Laps. c. 9. (t. 2. p. 316 c. n. 40.) .... Sanctorum petas auxilium, jaceas sub pedibus electorum.

[11] L. 5. c. 28. (v. 1. p. 253. 29.) Ὥστε ἔωθεν ἀναστῆναι, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενον σάκκον, καὶ σποδὸν καταπασάμενον, μετὰ πολλῆς σπουδῆς καὶ δακρύων προσπεσεῖν Ζεφυρίνῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, κυλιόμενον ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας οὐ μόνον τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν λαϊκῶν· συγχέαι τε τοῖς δάκρυσι τὴν εὔσπλαγχον ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ ἐλεήμονος Χριστοῦ· πολλῇ τε τῇ δεήσει χρησάμενον, δείξαντά τε τοὺς μώλωπας ὧν εἰλήφει πληγῶν, μόλις κοινωνηθῆναι.

and not only laid himself under the feet of the clergy, but the laity also; endeavouring to move the merciful Church of the merciful Christ to compassion with his tears, and by showing them the marks of the stripes which he had endured for the confession of Christ.' Where *falling at the feet of the laity, as well as the clergy*, can hardly refer to any thing else beside this preparatory introduction to penance, which the mourners used in the church-porch, when they cast themselves before the people, to beg their prayers, and obtain admission into the first apartment of the church.

Of the *audientes* or *hearers*.

4. When their petition was thus accepted, they were said to be admitted to penance; that is, to have liberty to pass through the several stages of discipline, which the Church appointed for the probation and trial of such as pretented real sorrow for any notorious offence, and the scandal given to the Church by the commission of it. This is the true meaning of those common phrases, which so often occur in the writings of the Ancients, *pœnitentiam dare*, and *pœnitentiam accipere, giving* and *receiving penance;* that is, granting or accepting the conditions of public penance in the church. Now, when men were admitted to this state, they were termed *audientes*, or *hearers*, which was the second order of penitents; or, if we please, the first of those that had any privilege to enter the church. These were allowed to stay and hear the Scriptures read and the sermon preached, but were obliged to depart, before any of the common prayers began, with the rest of those, catechumens and others, who went by the general name of *hearers only*.

There is frequent mention made of these in the ancient Canons[12], prescribing how long penitents were to continue in this station, a year, or two, or three, according as their offence required. Gregory Thaumaturgus[13] particularly assigns them their station in the narthex, or lowest part of the church,

[12] C. Nicæn. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 33 d.) Ὅσοι γνησίως μεταμέλονται, τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀκροωμένοις ποιήσουσιν, κ. τ. λ.—C. 12. (p. ibid. e.) Δέκα ἔτη ὑποπιπτέτωσαν, μετὰ τὸν τῆς τριετοῦς ἀκροάσεως χρόνον... Οὗτοι πληρώσαντες τὸν χρόνον τὸν ὡρισμένον τῆς ἀκροάσεως, τῶν εὐχῶν κοινωνήσουσι.—C. Ancyr. cc. 4, 6, 9. See n. 7, preceding.

[13] Ep. Canonic. c. 11. (CC. t. 1. p. 841 c.) Ἡ ἀκρόασις ἔνδοθι τῆς πύλης ἐν τῷ νάρθηκι· ἔνθα ἱστάναι χρὴ τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα, ἕως τῶν κατηχουμένων, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐξέρχεσθαι· ἀκούων γάρ, φησι, τῶν Γραφῶν καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ἐκβαλλέσθω, καὶ μὴ ἀξιούσθω προσευχῆς.

where they stood to hear with the catechumens of the first or second order, called *hearers*, and were dismissed with them as soon as the sermon was ended, before any prayers begun. St. Basil[14] says expressly, 'they were hearers only, and not allowed to be present at any prayers whatsoever.' Which agrees exactly with the order in the Constitutions[15], where the deacon is appointed to make proclamation, as soon as the sermon was ended, *Ne quis audientium, ne quis infidelium! Let none of the hearers, let none of the unbelievers be present!*

Of the kneelers or prostrators.

5. And in this they were distinguished from the penitents of the third order, who were called γονυκλίνοντες and ὑποπίπτοντες by the Greeks, and *genuflectentes* or *substrati*, by the Latins; that is, *kneelers* or *prostrators*, because they were allowed to stay and join in certain prayers particularly made for them, whilst they were kneeling upon their knees. Bellarmin[16] commits a strange mistake, and betrays a great deal of ignorance in the Greek tongue, whilst he explains the name ὑποπίπτωσις to be 'the station of those who were occupied in the contemplation of heavenly things;' taking the word to come from ὄπτομαι, *video, to see* or *contemplate;* whereas every one knows it comes from ὑποπίπτω, *to kneel*, or *fall down and lie prostrate on the ground*, whence they were properly denominated *kneelers* or *prostrators*. These were allowed to stay in the church after the hearers were dismissed, and hear the prayers that were offered up particularly for them by all the people, and receive imposition of hands from the bishop, who also made a particular prayer for them, which was styled, the imposition of hands upon the penitents, and the bishop's benediction. The Council of Laodicea[17] speaks of these prayers under

[14] C. 75. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 217. Canonic. Tert.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1753 c.) ... Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἄλλην τριετίαν εἰς ἀκρόασιν μόνην παραδεχθήτω, καὶ ἀκούων τῶν Γραφῶν [al. τῆς Γραφῆς] καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐκβαλλέσθω, καὶ μὴ καταξιούσθω προσευχῆς. — Vid. Greg. Nyssen. c. 3. (CC. ibid. p. 1784 d.) ... Ἐν τρισὶ ἔτεσι καθόλου τῆς εὐχῆς ἀποβλήτους εἶναι· ἐν τρισὶ τῆς ἀκροάσεως μετέχειν μόνης.

[15] L. 8. c. 5. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 392.) .... Καὶ πληρώσαντος αὐτοῦ τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγον ... ὁ διάκονος, ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος ἀνελθὼν, κηρυττέτω, Μή τις τῶν ἀκροωμένων, μή τις τῶν ἀπίστων.

[16] De Pœnitent. l. 1. c. 22. t. 3. p. 959. (t. 3. p. 1052 b.) Tertius locus eorum erat, qui admittebantur, tum ad audiendum, tum etiam ad orandum cum competentibus, non tamen ad sacrificium missæ cum fidelibus: et hic locus dicebatur ὑπόπτωσις, quasi contemplatio rerum supernarum.

[17] C. 19. (t. 1. p. 1500 c.) .... Καὶ μετὰ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς κατηχουμένους,

506436

this very title, calling them 'the prayers of those that were under penance and imposition of hands.' St. Chrysostom also mentions them more than once[18], styling them 'the prayers for the penitents,' and 'the prayers full of mercy,' because in them intercession was made to God for the penitents by the common voice both of the minister and people.

The author of the Constitutions has the forms of these prayers[19], which I omit here, because they have been recited at length in a more proper place[20], where we give an account of the ancient liturgy or service of the Church. The station of this sort of penitents was within the nave or body of the church[21], near unto the ambon, or reading-desk, where they received the bishop's imposition of hands and benediction. Some Canons[22] style this order simply *the penitents*, by way of emphasis, without any other distinction; because they were the most noted, and the greatest part of penitential acts belonged to them whilst they were in this station, of which I shall give a more particular account in the following chapters.

Of the *consistentes* or *co-standers*.

6. The last order of penitents were the *συνιστάμενοι*, *consistentes*, or *co-standers*, so called from their having liberty, after the other penitents, energumens, and catechumens, were dismissed, *to stand with the faithful at the altar*, and join in the common prayers, and see the oblation offered; but yet they might neither make their own oblations, nor partake of the eucharist with them. This the Council of Nice[23] calls, 'communicating with the people in prayers only without the oblation,' which for the crime of idolatry was to last for two years, after they had been three years hearers, and seven years prostrators before. The Council of Ancyra[24] often uses

τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ τὴν εὐχὴν γίνεσθαι· καὶ, τούτων προσελθόντων ὑπὸ χεῖρα καὶ ὑποχωρησάντων, οὕτως τῶν πιστῶν τὰς εὐχὰς γίνεσθαι τρεῖς, κ. τ. λ.

[18] Hom. 18. in 2 Cor. p. 873. (t. 10. p. 568 c.) Καὶ *γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐνεργουμένων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ, κοιναὶ καὶ παρὰ τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν γίνονται αἱ εὐχαί.*—Hom. 72. [Bened. 71. al. 72.] in Matth. p. 624. (t. 7. p. 699 e.) .... Καὶ *ἡ δευτέρα πάλιν ὑπὲρ ἑτέρων, τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ, πολὺ τὸ ἔλεος ἐπιζητοῦσα.*

[19] L. 8. cc. 8, 9. (Cotel. v. 1. pp. 395, seqq.) Ὁ *προειπὼν, κ. τ. λ.*

[20] B. 14. ch. 5. s. 10. v. 5. p. 203. n. 99. and p. 205. n. 99.

[21] Ep. Canonic. c. 11. (CC. t. 1. p. 841 c.) Ἡ *δὲ ὑπόπτωσις, ἵνα ἔσωθεν τῆς πύλης τοῦ ναοῦ ἱστάμενος μετὰ τῶν κατηχουμένων ἐξέρχηται.*

[22] C. Laodic. c. 19. See n. 17, preceding.

[23] C. 11. (t. 1. p. 33 d.) Δύο *ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνήσουσι τῷ λαῷ τῶν προσευχῶν.*—Vid. ibid. c. 12.

[24] C. 4. (ibid. p. 1457 c.) Περὶ *τῶν*

the same phrase of 'communicating in prayers only,' and 'communicating without the oblation:' and in one canon[25] expressly styles this order of penitents *the συνισάμενοι, co-standers;* by which name they are also distinguished in the Canons of Gregory Thaumaturgus[26], and frequently in the Canons of St. Basil[27]. In all which we may observe, that the word *communicating* does not always signify partaking of the eucharist, but communicating in prayers only without the oblation; which was but an imperfect sort of communion: in opposition to which, when they were admitted again to the eucharist, they were said[28] *ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον, to attain to perfection;* the participation of the eucharist being the highest state, or consummation and perfection, of a Christian.

This is the short account of these several orders of penitents, and their stations in the Church: but to have a complete view of the ancient manner of performing penance, it will be necessary to consider both the ceremony of admission to this state, and the several acts of penance which they performed during their progress or passage through the several stages of it; as also the length of time, or the duration and continuance of this exercise; which was often for a course of many years, and

πρὸς βίαν θυσάντων, ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις καὶ τῶν δειπνησάντων εἰς τὰ εἴδωλα, ὅσοι μὲν ἀπαγόμενοι καὶ σχήματι φαιδροτέρῳ ἀνῆλθον, καὶ ἐσθῆτι ἐχρήσαντο πολυτελεστέρᾳ, καὶ μετέσχον τοῦ παρασκευασθέντος δείπνου ἀδιαφόρως· ἔδοξεν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀκροᾶσθαι, ὑποπεσεῖν δὲ τρία ἔτη, εὐχῆς δὲ μόνης κοινωνῆσαι ἔτη δύο, καὶ τότε ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον.—C. 8. (ibid. p. 1460 c.) *Οἱ δὲ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον θύσαντες μετὰ βίας, τετραετίαν ὑποπεσέτωσαν, δύο δὲ ἔτη χωρὶς προσφορᾶς κοινωνησάτωσαν, καὶ τῷ ἑβδόμῳ τελείως δεχθήτωσαν.*—C. 16. (ibid. p. 1461 c.) *Πέντε καὶ δέκα ἔτεσιν ὑποπεσόντες κοινωνίας τυγχανέτωσαν τῆς εἰς τὰς προσευχάς.*—C. 24. (ibid. p. 1464 d.) *Οἱ καταμαντευόμενοι ... ὑπὸ τὸν κανόνα πιπτέτωσαν τῆς πενταετίας κατὰ τοὺς βαθμοὺς ὡρισμένους, τρία ἔτη ὑποπτώσεως καὶ δύο ἔτη εὐχῆς χωρὶς προσφορᾶς.*

[25] C. 25. (ibid. p. 1464 e.) *Οἱ συνειδότες ἐκελεύσθησαν ἐν δεκαετίᾳ δεχθῆναι εἰς τοὺς συνεστῶτας, κατὰ τοὺς ὡρισμένους βαθμούς.*

[26] Ep. Canonic. c. 11. (CC. ibid. p. 841 c.) .... *Ἡ σύστασις, ἵνα συνίσταται τοῖς πιστοῖς, καὶ μὴ ἐξέρχηται μετὰ τῶν κατηχουμένων.*

[27] C. 22. See n. 9, preceding.—C. 56. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 217. Canonic. Tert.] (CC. t. 1. p. 1748 d.) ... *Συστήσεται μόνον τοῖς πιστοῖς, προσφορᾶς δὲ οὐ μεταλήψεται.*—C. 57. [Oper. Basil. ibid.] (CC. ibid. e.) *Ἐν ἐνιαυτῷ σταθήσεται μόνον.*—C. 58. [Oper. Basil. ibid.] (CC. ibid. p. 1749 a.) *Ἐν δ' μὲν ἔτεσι προσκλαίων ἔσται· ἐν ε' δὲ ἀκροώμενος· ἐν δ' ὑποπίπτων· ἐν δυσὶ συνεστὼς ἄνευ κοινωνίας.*—Conf. cc. 59, 61, 66, 75.

[28] C. Ancyr. c. 4. See n. 24, preceding.—Conf. c. 5. (t. 1. p. 1457 d.) .... *Τῷ τρίτῳ κοινωνησάτωσαν χωρὶς προσφορᾶς, ἵνα τὸ τέλειον τῇ τετραετίᾳ λάβωσι.*—C. 6. (ibid. p. 1460 a.) .... *Οὕτως ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον.*

sometimes to the hour of death, without any remission or relaxation. The considering all which will give us an exact and clear idea of the ancient discipline, and show us at once both the severity, and prudence, and purity of the Church, in proceeding with sharpness against great delinquents, as well to examine the sincerity of their repentance, as to take off the scandal cast upon religion, and prevent their backsliding and relapses for the future. Of these things therefore in the following chapters.

CHAP. II.

Of the ceremonies used in admitting penitents to do public penance, and the manner of performing it in the church.

Penitents first admitted to penance by imposition of hands.

1. When a penitent desired to be admitted to do public penance, and his petition was accepted, the first ceremony that was used was to grant him penance, as the phrase was, by imposition of hands. For this was a ceremony used almost in all religious actions, when any person was solemnly to be recommended to God in prayer. There were many other impositions of hands given them daily, when they came into the third order of penitents; but this was previous to their admission, or rather the form and ceremony of it, when they were first taken in to be hearers in the church. For this we have the plain testimony of the Council of Agde[29], which orders, 'that penitents, at the time when they desire to be admitted to do penance, shall receive imposition of hands from the bishop, and sackcloth to cover their heads.'

And obliged to appear in sackcloth and ashes upon their heads.

2. In which canon we may observe another rite and custom of common use in this matter: which was, that penitents were obliged to appear in sackcloth, as an indication and token of their great sorrow and indignation against themselves. Other writers join sackcloth and ashes together; for so Eusebius[30] describing the penitential mien of Natalis the confessor, upon his return from the Theodosian heretics to the Church, says, 'he came clothed in sackcloth and sprinkled with ashes.' And St.

[29] C. 15. (t. 4. p. 1385 b.) Pœnitentes tempore quo pœnitentiam petunt impositionem manuum et cilicium super caput a sacerdote.... consequantur.

[30] L. 5. c. 28. See n. 11, preceding.—Conf. C. Tolet. 3. c. 12. See n. 41, following.

Ambrose[31] writing to a virgin that had lapsed, plainly alludes to both customs, when he tells her, 'she must macerate her whole body, sprinkling it with ashes, and covering it with sackcloth.' In like manner Tertullian[32], discoursing of public penance, says, 'it obliges the sinner to change both his diet and his habit, to defile his body, and lie in sackcloth and ashes.'

Neither were the greatest personages exempted from this ceremony. For St. Jerom[33], describing the penance of Fabiola, one of the greatest ladies in Rome, says, 'she stood in sackcloth in the order of penitents in the Lateran Church, to make public confession of her fault in the sight of all the people of Rome:' and they continued the use of it during their passage through all the stages of repentance. For even at last they appeared in sackcloth, when the course of their whole penance was ended, and 'in this garb,' as the Council of Toledo[34] words it, 'were absolved, and reconciled to the altar of God.' And this is always the meaning of those expressions which speak of penitents changing their garb, and taking the mournful habit of repentance.

Some think this was always done precisely on Ash-Wednesday, or the beginning of Lent, which from thence was called *dies cinerum, the day of sprinkling ashes*, and *caput jejunii, the head* or *beginning of the fast.* But this, for ought I can find, is founded upon very uncertain tradition, and the authority of modern authors; there being a perfect silence in the more ancient writers about it. Bellarmin[35] cites the authority

[31] Ad Virg. Laps. c. 8. (t. 2. p. 314 d. n. 35.) .... Totum corpus incuria [al. injuriis et jejuniis] maceretur, cinere aspersum et opertum cilicio.—Vid. Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 137. (p. 98.) Orare oportet impensius et rogare, diem luctu transigere, vigiliis noctes ac fletibus ducere, tempus omne lacrymosis lamentationibus occupare, stratos solo adhærere cineri, in cilicio et sordibus volutari, &c.

[32] De Pœnitent. c. 9. (p. 127 a.) .... De ipso quoque habitu atque victu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare.

[33] Ep. 30. [al. 77.] Epitaph. Fabiolæ. (t. 1. p. 455 d.) Quis hoc crederet, ut saccum indueret, ut errorem publice fateretur, et, tota urbe spectante Romana, ante diem Paschæ in basilica Laterani .... staret in ordine pœnitentium?

[34] Tolet. 1. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 1224 a.) .... Qui sub cilicio divino reconciliatus est altario.

[35] De Pœnitent. l. 1. c. 22. (t. 3. p. 1052 d.) Quod attinet ad tempus, imponebatur pœnitentia publica feria quarta, ante primam dominicam Quadragesimæ, quæ dicitur, *In capite jejunii*, ut testatur Concilium Agathense can. 15., teste Gratiano dist. 50. can. *In capite*: nam ea verba non inveniuntur in vulgatis canoni-

of the Council of Agde for it: but this is only to be found in Gratian[36], for there is no such canon in the tomes of the Councils. And the Roman correctors[37] of Gratian own as much, referring us to the Roman *Pœnitentiale*, and Pontifical, and the *Ordo Romanus* for the substance of it. And so, Baluzius[38] says, Burchardus has it out of the Roman *Pœnitentiale*, which is of a much later date: neither does the canon, as cited by Gratian, prove the thing in question, but only describes the ceremony that was used towards penitents in the beginning of Lent, whether they were then first admitted to penance, or had been admitted before: which very thing supposes, that penance might be imposed at other times, as well as the first day of Lent, as the old gloss upon Gratian rightly observes.

The ceremony, as it is described by Gratian, seems only to be an account of the discipline used towards penitents in Lent, different from their treatment at other seasons of the year. For, '*In capite Quadragesimæ*[39], *on Ash-Wednesday, or the*

bus ejus Concilii. Habemus adhuc vestigium hujus ritus in consecratione et aspersione cineris, quæ eo die fieri solet. Et quamvis tempus pœnitendi aliis longius, aliis brevius præscriberetur, ut trium, septem, decem, aut plurium annorum; tamen singulis annis, in quinta feria majoris hebdomadæ, omnes reconciliabantur et communicabant.

[36] Distinct. 50. c. 64. (t. 1. p. 266. 10.) Item ex eodem [C. Agathensi. Tit. Quæ sint servanda in solemni pœnitentia.]

[37] [In loc. ibid. 70. n. 8.) Ex Agathensi etiam citant Burchardus et Ivo, et Rhebaldus cardinalis, qui tempore Paschalis pontificis claruit, in libro suo, de pœnitentia publice non iteranda. In uno tamen manuscripto Burchardi exemplari citatur ex Pœnitentiali Romano. Sententia vero hujus capitis, magna ex parte, habetur in Pontificali et Ordine Romano, a pag. 24 usque ad 30. *Grischov.*]

[38] Not. ad Gratian. p. 464. (Oper. Ant. August. t. 3. p. 176. col. dextr.) Regino, (lib. 1. cap. 91.,) citat istud caput ex eodem Concilio, ex quo retulerat caput quod præcedit, id est, ex Concilio Agathensi, ubi non exstat. Item Burchardus, lib. 9. cap. 26. in editis. Admonent tamen correctores Romani, in uno manuscripto Burchardi exemplari citari ex Pœnitentiali Romano. Quo etiam modo citatur in alio antiquissimo Burchardi exemplari, quod exstat in bibliotheca illustrissimi viri Dionysii Talorii, regii advocati in parlamento Parisiensi.

[39] [Distinct. 50. c. 64. (t. 1. p. 266. 20.) In capite Quadragesimæ omnes pœnitentes, qui publicam suscipiunt aut susceperunt pœnitentiam, ante fores ecclesiæ se repræsentent episcopo civitatis, sacco induti, nudis pedibus, vultibus in terram demissis, reos se esse ipso habitu et vultu protestantes. Ibi adesse debent decani, id est, archipresbyteri parochiarum, et presbyteri pœnitentium, qui eorum conversationem diligenter inspicere debent, et secundum modum culpæ pœnitentiam per præfatos gradus injungere. Post hæc eos in ecclesiam introducant, et cum omni clero septem pœnitentiales Psalmos in terra prostratus episcopus cum lacrymis pro eorum absolutione decantet: tunc resurgens

first day of Lent, all penitents, who either then were admitted to penance, or had been admitted before, were presented to the bishop before the doors of the church, clothed in sackcloth, barefooted, and with countenances dejected to the earth, confessing themselves guilty both by their habit and their looks. They were to be attended by the deans or archpresbyters of the parishes, and the penitential presbyters, whose office was to inspect their conversation, and enjoin them penance according to the measure of their faults by the degrees of penance that were appointed. After this they bring them into the church, and then the bishop with all the clergy falling prostrate on the ground, sing the seven penitential psalms with tears for their absolution. After this the bishop rising from prayer, gives them imposition of hands, sprinkles them with holy water, puts ashes upon their heads, and then covers their heads with sackcloth, declaring with sighs and groans, that as Adam was cast out of Paradise, so they for their sins are cast out of the Church: then he commands the inferior ministers to expel them out of the doors of the church; and the clergy follow them, using this responsory, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread: for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return." In the end of Lent, on the Thursday before Easter called *Cœna Domini*, the deans and presbyters are to present them before the gates of the church again.'

Thus far Gratian's account, which is manifestly not a determining the time of imposing penance to be the first day of Lent, but a description of the manner of treating all penitents in Lent, whatever time their penance was imposed upon them. And as there are some things in it conformable to the ancient discipline, so there are many things in it that plainly discover it to have relation to a more modern practice. For there was

ab oratione, juxta quod canones jubent, manus eis imponat, aquam benedictam super eos spargat, cinerem prius mittat, deinde cilicio capita eorum operiat: et cum gemitu et crebris suspiriis denuntiet eis, quod sicut Adam projectus est de Paradiso, ita ipsi ab ecclesia pro peccatis abjiciuntur: posthæc jubeat ministris, ut eos extra januas ecclesiæ expellant; clerus vero prosequatur eos cum responsorio, *In sudore vultus tui vesceris pane tuo, etc.*, ut, videntes sanctam ecclesiam pro facinoribus suis tremefactam atque commotam, non parvi pendant pœnitentiam. In sacra autem Domini Cœna rursus ab eorum decanis et eorum presbyteris ecclesiæ liminibus præsententur. *Grischov.*]

no use of holy water in the ancient discipline; nor seven penitential Psalms in the ancient service, but only one penitential Psalm, that is the fifty-first, commonly distinguished by the name of *Psalmus Exomologeseos, the Penitential Psalm*, or *Psalm of Confession*. Neither was Ash-Wednesday anciently the first day of Lent, till Gregory the Great first added it to Lent, to make the number of fasting days completely forty, which before were but thirty-six. Neither does it appear, that anciently the time of imposing penance was confined to the beginning of Lent, but penance was granted at all times, whenever the bishop thought the sinner qualified for it: as St. Ambrose admitted Theodosius to penance at Christmas; and there are many examples of the like nature. The circumstance therefore of time must be passed over as unlimited and uncertain. Only whenever penance was imposed, the sinner was obliged to change his habit, and appear in a mournful dress, agreeable to a state of repentance: which is all that can be concluded from any of the ancient canons which speak of the circumstances of repentance.

And to cut off their hair, or go veiled, as another token of sorrow and mourning.

3. At the same time that they changed their habit, some canons obliged penitents to cut off their hair, or shave their heads, if they were men, as another indication of sorrow and mourning. And women were enjoined to wear a penitential veil, and either to cut off their hair, or appear with it dishevelled, and hanging loose about their shoulders; which was another token of deep sorrow and affliction. The Council of Agde made a peremptory order [40], 'that if any, who desired to be admitted to penance, refused to cut off their hair, they should be rejected.' And the third Council of Toledo has a like order [41], 'that when any one desires penance of the bishop, he shall first poll him, and make him change his habit for sackcloth and ashes, and so admit him to do penance.' Optatus [42] alludes to this custom, when speaking of the rude-

[40] C. 15. (t. 4. p. 1386 a.) Si autem comas non deposuerint, aut vestimenta non mutaverint, abjiciantur.

[41] C. 12. (t. 5. p. 1012 a.) Quicunque ab episcopo . . . pœnitentiam postulat, prius eum tondeat, [aut in cinere et cilicio habitum mutare faciat,] et sic pœnitentiam ei tradat. Si vero mulier fuerit, non accipiat pœnitentiam, nisi prius [aut velata fuerit, aut] mutaverit habitum.

[42] L. 2. p. 58. (p. 54.) Ubi vobis mandatum est radere capita sacerdotum?. . . Qui parare debebas aures ad audiendum, parasti novaculam

ness of the Donatists in bringing some Catholic bishops to do penance, he says, that contrary to all rules they had shaved the heads of the priests: they, who ought to prepare ears to hear their instructions, had prepared razors to sin against them; that is, they had made them do public penance in order to retain their clerical office, which ought not to be done; for if a clergyman was to do public penance, he ought first to be degraded for his offence, and do penance only as a layman.

As to women, the custom was to put them on a penitential veil, which is expressly required by the third Council of Toledo[43], appointing 'that no woman should be admitted to do penance, except she was first veiled, and had changed her habit.' Whence Optatus[44] calls such veils *the veils of repentance;* objecting it to the Donatists, 'that they had forced the Catholic virgins, who were innocent, to submit to their imposition of hands, and wear upon their heads the veils of repentance.' St. Ambrose seems to intimate that they also had their heads sometimes shorn or shaven. For writing to a virgin[45] who had committed fornication, he bids her 'cut off her hair, which through vain-glory had given her occasion to sin.' But this was no general custom: for St. Jerom, describing the penance of Fabiola[46], says, 'she did it *sparso crine, with her hair dishevelled,* the bishop and presbyters and all the people weeping with her.'

Whence we may observe also, with what seriousness, gravity, and concern this whole matter was transacted. For not only the party under penance took shame to himself, and by these ceremonies expressed his sorrow with tears; but the whole Church with a compassionate fellow-feeling took share in his grief, suffering with a suffering member, and weeping and mourning together with him. After this manner Socrates [Sozomen] represents the practice of the Roman Church in

ad delinquendum.—Vid. Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 135. See the last part of n. 31, preceding.

[43] C. 12. See the last clause of n. 41, preceding.

[44] L. 2. p. 59. (p. 54.) Extendistis manum, et super omne caput mortifera velamina prætendistis.—Ibid. p. 61. (p. 58.) Cum super earum capita velamina pœnitentiæ tenditis.

[45] Ad Virg. Lapsam, c. 8. (t. 2. p. 314 c. n. 35.) Amputentur crines, qui per vanam gloriam occasionem luxuriæ præstiterunt.

[46] Ep. 30. [al. 77.] (t. 1. p. 457 a.) ... Ut staret in ordine pœnitentium, episcopo, presbyteris et omni populo collacrymantibus? sparso crine, ora lurida, et squalidas manus, sordida colla submitteret?

this exercise, telling us[47], 'that not only the penitents prostrated themselves upon the ground with lamentation and wailing, but that the bishop meeting them in their proper station, fell to the earth likewise with tears, whilst all the congregation wept with them. Then the bishop rose up, and raised the penitents likewise, and made the usual prayers for them before the mystical service began, and so dismissed them from the church.' This was a very solemn way of performing penance, that made a just impression upon the whole Church, whilst every man was touched with a sense of his brethren's folly, and made their sins, not matter of sport or ridicule, but an occasion of expressing his pity and compassion toward them, as members of the same body, weeping with those that wept, and joining his prayers and tears with theirs, to besiege heaven with united force, and obtain of God mercy and pardon for them.

Penitents to abstain from bathing, and other innocent diversions of life, as feasting, &c.

4. Socrates [Sozomen] takes notice in the same place[48], that penitents were used to abstain from bathing and other innocent diversions of life. For, he says, 'they exercised themselves willingly in private, ἢ νηστείαις, ἢ ἀλουσίαις, ἢ ἐδεσμάτων ἀποχῇ, *with fastings, and neglect of bathing, and abstinence from meats*, as long as the bishop thought fit to enjoin them.' Which is also intimated by Pacian[49], when he brings in the penitent declaring, 'that if any one called him to the bath, he refused such delights: if any one called him to a feast, his answer was, Those things belong to the happy; but as for me, I have sinned against the Lord, and am in danger of eternal destruction.'

[47] L. 7. c. 16. (v. 2. p. 300. 3.) Ἤδη δὲ πληρωθείσης τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργίας, μὴ μετασχόντες ὧν μύσταις θέμις, σὺν οἰμωγῇ καὶ ὀδυρμῷ πρηνεῖς ἐπὶ γῆς ῥίπτουσι σφᾶς· ἀντιπρόσωπος δέ, δεδακρυμένος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος προσδραμὼν, ὁμοίως ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐδάφου πίπτει· σὺν ὀλολυγῇ καὶ τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πλῆθος δακρύων ἐμπιπλᾶται· τὸ μετὰ τοῦτο δέ, πρῶτος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐξανίσταται, καὶ τοὺς κειμένους ἀνίστησι· καὶ ᾗ προσῆκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμαρτηκότων μεταμελουμένων εὐξάμενος, ἀποπέμπει.

[48] [Ibid. (p. ead. 12.) Καθ' ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἑκοντὶ ταλαιπωρούμενος ἕκαστος, ἢ νηστείαις, ἢ ἀλουσίαις, ἢ ἐδεσμάτων ἀποχῇ, ἢ ἑτέροις οἷς προστέτακται, περιμένει τὸν χρόνον, εἰς ὅσον αὐτῷ τέταχεν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος. *Grischov.*]

[49] Paræneſis ad Pœnitent. ap. Bibl. Patr. Paris. 1654. t. 3. p. 73. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 272 c.) .... Si quis ad balneum vocet, recusare delicias; si quis ad convivium roget, dicere, Ista felicibus! ego deliqui in Dominum, et periclitor in æternum perire.—Vid. Tertullian. de Pœnitent. c. 9. (p. 127 a.) Plerumque vero jejuniis preces alere, &c.—Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 137. (p. 98.) .... In cilicio et sordibus volutari; post iudumentum Christi perditum nullum hic jam velle vestitum; post Diaboli cibum malle jejunium; &c.—See also n. 31, preceding.

5. And as they thus exercised themselves in private abstinence, mortification, and fasting; so they were more especially obliged to observe all the public fasts of the Church. There might be some reasons to excuse others, and dispense with the rigour and severity of this exercise in some cases and circumstances, requiring a little abatement in the laws of fasting: but penitents were tied up to the strictest observance of them. And therefore the fourth Council of Carthage made a decree [50], 'that penitents should present themselves at church on all times of fasting, and receive imposition of hands from the priests.'

To observe all the public fasts of the Church.

6. Some directions are also given, at least by private writers, that penitents should abstain from the use of the marriage bed during their continuance in the state of public penance. This is a rule laid down by St. Jerom [51], 'that in the time of fasting the bridegroom and the bride should sequester themselves from one another;' ... 'for he that says he does penance by abstinence from meat, and by fasting and alms, in vain uses this speech, except he go out of his chamber, and make his fast holy and pure by adding continence to his repentance.' And so St. Ambrose [52] reckons this a necessary part of self-denial upon such an occasion: 'Does any one think that to be repentance, where a man is engaged in an ambitious pursuit of honour, and indulges himself in the use of wine and the marriage bed? Men must renounce the world, abridge themselves of sleep, which nature requires, entreat the favour of God with sighing and mourning and earnest prayers, and live so as to die to the use of this life, and deny themselves, and become wholly new men.'

To restrain themselves in the use of the conjugal state.

7. I cannot be positive, and therefore will not venture to affirm it absolutely, that this was imposed by any public rule of the Church, because I remember no canon at present that

For which reason no married persons

[50] C. 80. (t. 2. p. 1206 c.) Omni tempore jejunii manus pœnitentibus a sacerdotibus imponatur.

[51] In Joel. c. 2. (t. 6. p. 193 a.) In tempore jejunii .... non serviat sponsus et sponsa operi nuptiali.... Qui in castigatione victus, et jejunio, et eleemosynis dicit se agere pœnitentiam, frustra hoc sermone promittit, nisi egrediatur de cubili suo, et sanctum purumque jejunium pudica expleat pœnitentia.

[52] De Pœnitent. l. 2. c. 10. (t. 2. p. 436 e. n. 96.) An quisquam illam pœnitentiam putat, ubi acquirendæ ambitio dignitatis, ubi vini effusio, ubi ipsius copulæ conjugalis usus? Renunciandum sæculo est, somno ipsi minus indulgendum: ... seipsum sibi homo abneget, &c.

were admitted to penance, but by consent of both parties.

precisely enjoins it. The only thing that may incline a man to think there was such a rule, is, that there is another rule of near relation to it, and which seems to be grounded upon the presumption of such a practice: that is an order we find in the second Council of Arles[53], 'that penance should not be granted to any married people, man or woman, without the desire and consent of both parties.' This seems to be grounded upon a supposition, that penitents were under obligation to contain during the time of their penance; and if the innocent party would not consent, no force or compulsion could be laid upon them. For the laws of matrimony are prior to any rules that could be made about the exercise of public discipline by the Church.

Penitents not allowed to marry in the time of their penance.

8. It is another rule of the same Council[54], proceeding upon the like reason and supposition of perfect continency in public penitents, 'that no penitent, man or woman, should have liberty to marry whilst they were doing penance: and if they did, they should be rejected and debarred even from entering under the roof of the church.' Or if they held any suspicious conversation, or unlawful familiarity with strangers in this state, they were liable to the same censure. For all this was thought improper in their circumstances, and inconsistent with the profession of a solemn and deep repentance.

Penitents obliged to pray kneeling on all festivals and days of relaxation.

9. And, whereas all others might pray standing on all festivals, on the Lord's-day, on the commemorations of martyrs, and the whole fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, which were called *days of relaxation*, and the standing posture was appointed to be used on them by the laws of the Church, penitents are particularly excepted from this privilege, and obliged to pray kneeling at these times as well as any other. For this posture was most agreeable to their state, whose devotions consisted only in the expression of a deep humility and sorrow for sin, for which kneeling was thought the most decent posture. Therefore as others were obliged to pray kneeling on their stationary days, and days of fasting, because those

[53] C. 22. (t. 4. p. 1013 d.) Pœnitentiam conjugatis non nisi ex consensu dandam.

[54] C. 21. (ibid. d.) Pœnitentes, quæ defuncto viro, aliis nubere præsumpserint, vel suspecta vel interdicta familiaritate se cum extraneo junxerint, cum eodem ab ecclesiæ liminibus arceantur. Hoc etiam de viro in pœnitentia posito placuit observari. [Labbe and Cossart read the ruling nouns and the verbs in the singular number. Ed.]

were times of more solemn humiliation: so the penitents were obliged to kneel every day[55], even on the days of remission, because every day was a day of humiliation to them, and their business in the church was only to sue for mercy, and to prostrate themselves to receive the solemn imposition of hands and benediction.

Penitents obliged to show their liberality t the poor.

10. And because mercy and liberality to the poor was a great argument and evidence of repentance, this was always in an eminent degree exacted of them. Cyprian puts this among the other indications of repentance. 'Can we think', says he[56], 'that that man laments with his whole heart, and deprecates the Lord with fasting, weeping, and mourning, who, from the very moment of his sinning, daily frequents the baths, who feeds himself with luxurious feasting, and fills his belly to an extraordinary pitch, only to belch forth his crudities the day after? who imparts not his meat and drink to the necessities of the poor? How does he bewail his own death, who walks about with a merry and cheerful countenance? who trims his beard and attires his face? Does he think to please men, who displeases God? Does that woman lament and mourn, who is at leisure to put on her costly clothing, and never thinks of the garment of Christ, which she has lost?' In such a case he thinks charity to the poor would be a more becoming ornament than all their silks, and jewels, and gold: therefore he advises them to put on the ornament of Christ, that they might not appear naked before him.

Penitents obliged to minister and serve the Churc in burying the dead.

11. Finally, in some Churches the penitents were obliged to take upon them the office and care of burying the dead: and this by way of discipline, and exercise of humility and charity, which were so becoming their station. In many Churches,

[55] Vid. Carth. 4. c. 82. (t. 2. p. 1206 c.) Pœnitentes etiam diebus remissionis genua flectent.

[56] De Lapsis, p. 134. (p. 96.) Lamentari eum putamus ex toto corde, jejuniis, fletibus, planctibus Dominum deprecari; qui ex primo criminis die lavacra quotidie celebrat, qui epulis affluentibus pastus, et sagina largiore distentus, cruditates suas postridie ructat, nec cibos et potus suos cum pauperum necessitate communicat? Qui hilaris ac lætus incedit, quomodo mortem suam deflet? Cumque scriptum sit, *Non corrumpetis effigiem barbæ vestræ;* barbam vellit, et faciem suam comit? Et placere nunc cuiquam studet, qui Deo displicet? An illa ingemiscit et plangit, cui vacat cultum pretiosæ vestis induere, nec indumentum Christi, quod perdidit, cogitare? accipere pretiosa ornamenta et monilia elaborata, nec divini et cœlestis ornatus damna deflere?

especially those of greater note, this business devolved upon a certain order of men, called *parabolani*, whose office [57] was particularly to attend the sick, and take care to bury the dead: but probably there was no such standing office in many Churches, and therefore this employment was put upon the penitents as a proper exercise for men in their condition. It is certain it was so in the African Churches: for the fourth Council of Carthage [58] gives a particular direction in the case, 'that the penitents should bear out the dead to the church, and take care of their burial.'

These were some of those wholesome and salutary exercises with which the ancient Church disciplined her penitents, especially those of the third order, who were more emphatically called *penitents*, as being in the state of prostrators, which was the most noted order of penitents in the Church. But there is one eminent act of penance, belonging to this order, yet behind; that is, the *exomologesis*, or *confession*: which, because it has been turned into a new thing by the Church of Rome, and occasioned some great disputes, I have purposely reserved for a distinct handling, and shall make it the subject of a particular dissertation in the following chapter.

CHAP. III.

A particular account of the exomologesis, or confession, used in the discipline of the ancient Church; showing it to be a different thing from the private or auricular confession introduced by the Church of Rome.

The gross mistake of those who make the *exomologesis* of the ancient Church to signify *auricular confession*.

1. THERE is nothing more common among the polemical writers of the Romish Church, than wherever they meet with the word *exomologesis* in any of the ancient writers, to interpret it *private* or *auricular confession*, such as is now practised in the communion of that Church, aud imposed upon them as absolutely necessary to salvation. But they who, with greater judgment and ingenuity among themselves have more narrowly considered the matter, make no scruple to confess that the *exomologesis* of the Ancients signifies a quite different thing, viz.

[57] See b. 3. ch. 9. v. 1. p. 339.

[58] C. 81. (t. 2. p. 1206 c.) Mortuos pœnitentes ecclesiæ afferant et sepeliant.

the whole exercise of public penance, of which public confession was a noted part.

The learned Albaspinæus very strenuously sets himself to refute this error in the writers of his own party. 'Cardinal Bellarmin,' says he[59], 'and Baronius, and Maldonat in his Controversies, and Pamelius in his Commentaries upon Tertullian and Cyprian, lay it down as a certain truth, that the Fathers generally take the word *exomologesis* for *private and auricular confession:* but having long and accurately considered all the places where it is mentioned, I cannot come in to their opinion.' 'The Fathers,' adds he[60], 'always use this word, when they would describe the external rites of penance, viz. weeping, and mourning, and self-accusation, and other the like things, which penitents usually practised in the course of public penance. For no one can be ignorant, that in those first ages, penitents performed a long and laborious penance, wherein they mortified themselves with continual weeping, and stood before the gates of the church to give public testimony of their sorrow for the sin they had committed: moreover that they cast themselves on the ground at the bishop's feet, and fell down at the knees of the martyrs, and besought all the

[59] Observat. l. 2. c. 26. p. 153. (ad calc. Optat. p. 90 b.) Multi, ut Cardinales Bellarminus et Baronius anno Domini 1556, Maldonatus in suis Controversiis, Pamelius suis ad Tertullianum et Divum Cyprianum Commentariis, pro certo asserunt, Patres, ut plurimum, hac voce confessionem peccatorum arcanam et auricularem intellexisse; verum, diu multumque pensitatis omnibus ubi ea habetur locis, illorum opinioni non possum accedere.

[60] Ibid. (p. 90 c.) Mihi videtur... Patres semper... hanc vocem *exomologesis* adhibuisse, cum significare vellent ritus exteriores, utpote flendi, ingemiscendi, se ipsum incusandi, et id genus alia pœnitentibus usitata. Atque, ut perfectius istius vocabuli usus innotescat, neminem præterit illis prioribus sæculis pœnitentes longa admodum et laboriosa defunctos esse pœnitentia, perquam assiduis fletibus se ipsos conficerent, pro vestibulis ædium sacrarum starent ad testandum publice erroris sui dolorem: quin et humi jacentes episcoporum pedibus, martyrum genibus advolverentur, cæterorum quoque fidelium, identidem orantes unumquemque, ut sibi apud Deum deprecator adesset, operti sacco, horrore squaloreque prorsus obsiti. Peracta vero pœnitentia, episcopus eos ex aditu in medium templi deductos, coram presbyteris, diaconis, viduis, et populo sistebat, ubi rursus humi procumbebant, crimina sua detestabantur, ubertim flebant, omnium se precibus commendantes, nec unquam eodem se relapsuros sancte dejerantes. Comperio itaque ultimum hunc ritum ob id sæpe *exomologesin* a Patribus esse nuncupatum, quod in se plurimos actus haberet, dolorem admissæ culpæ præferentes; non secus ac omnis actio et ratio vitæ pœnitentium inter pœnitentiam agendam perinde *exomologesis* aliquando dicitur.

rest of the faithful, that they would become intercessors to God for them, being clothed in sackcloth, and covered with filthiness and horror: and that when they had gone thus far in their penance, the bishop was used to bring them from the doors into the church, and set them before the presbyters, the deacons, the widows, and all the people; where again they were used to prostrate themselves on the ground, detesting their sins, and commending themselves to the prayers of all, and solemnly protesting, that they would never relapse or return to their former condition again. And upon this account,' says he, 'we often find this last rite called *exomologesis* by the Fathers, because it contained many acts in it, expressing sorrow for the crimes they had committed; in like manner as the whole action and tenour of a penitent's life, whilst he is doing penance, is sometimes called *exomologesis* by the Fathers.' This he proves and confirms from many irrefragable testimonies out of Tertullian, Cyprian, and other ancient writers, which I shall not here relate, but only allege one passage of Tertullian, which comes home to the present purpose. 'The *exomologesis*,' says he[61], 'is the discipline of a man's prostrating and humbling himself, enjoining him a conversation that moves God to mercy and compassion. It obliges a man to change his habit and his diet, to lie in sackcloth and ashes, to defile his body by a neglect of dress and ornament, to afflict his soul with sorrow, and to change his former sinful conversation by a quite contrary practice: to use meat and drink, not to please his appetite, but only for preservation of life; to

[61] De Pœnitent. c. 9. (p. 127 a.) .... Exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est, conversationem injungens misericordiæ illicem. De ipso quoque habitu et victu mandat, sacco et cineri incubare, corpus sordibus obscurare, animum mœroribus dejicere, illa quæ peccavit, tristi tractatione mutare: cæterum pastum et potum pura non esse [al. nosse], non ventris scilicet, sed animæ causa: plerumque vero jejuniis preces alere, ingemiscere, lacrymari, mugire dies noctesque ad Dominum Deum suum [al. tuum], presbyteris advolvi et caris [al. aris *male* *] Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere. Hæc omnia exomologesis, ut pœnitentiam commendet, ut de periculi timore Dominum honoret, ut in peccatorem ipsa pronuntians pro Dei indignatione fungatur, et temporali afflictione æterna supplicia non dicam frustretur, sed expungat.

* [See this cited and noticed before, b. 1. ch. 4. s. 4. v. 1. p. 32. n. 63. Also, b. 8. ch. 6. s. 12. v. 3. p. 91. n. 21. See also Ambrose, as cited before, ch. 1. s. 3. p. 97. n. 10, preceding. Ed.]

quicken his prayers and devotions by frequent fastings; to groan and weep, and cry unto the Lord God both day and night; to prostrate himself before the presbyters of the Church, to kneel before the friends of God, and beg of all the brethren that they would become intercessors for his pardon: all this the *exomologesis* requires to recommend a true repentance.' Here is not a syllable of private or auricular confession, but all relates to the public confession before the Church; and that not so much in words, as in actions, expressing their repentance in public demonstrations of their sorrow, and the uniform tenour of a penitent behaviour; which was of far greater moment to signify and evidence their conversion, than the most pathetical words of any mere verbal or private confession.

No necessity of auricular confession ever urged by the ancient Church.

2. And this is one argument to prove, that the doctrine of the necessity of auricular confession was wholly unknown to the ancient Church. For when public discipline was in general use, and all men were disposed to submit to it, there could be little occasion for private confession, the reason and ground of which was much better answered by the public. But besides this, there is most plain and direct evidence from the testimonies of the Ancients, that no necessity was laid upon any man to make private confession of all or any of his secret sins to a priest, as a matter of indispensable obligation, either to qualify him for the reception of the eucharist, or to give him a title to the communion of the Church and eternal life. I have already[62] shown this, with a particular respect to the reception of the eucharist, out of some very plain passages of Chrysostom, Gennadius, Laurentius Novariensis, and other ancient writers; to which I shall here add such other testimonies as evidently show they required no private confession to be made to man, except in some very particular cases.

St. Chrysostom[63], exhorting men to repentance, says, 'I bid

[62] B. 15. ch. 8. s. 6. v. 5. p. 504.

[63] Hom. 31. in Hebr. p. 1966. (t. 12. p. 289 d.) Οὐ λέγω σοι, ἐκπόμπευσον σαυτὸν, οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις κατηγόρησον, ἀλλὰ πείθεσθαι συμβουλεύω τῷ Προφήτῃ λέγοντι, Ἀποκάλυψον πρὸς Κύριον τὴν ὁδόν σου· ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ταῦτα ὁμολόγησον, ἐπὶ τοῦ Δικαστοῦ ὁμολόγει τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, εὐχόμενος, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῇ γλώττῃ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μνήμῃ, καὶ οὕτως ἀξίου ἐλεηθῆναι ..... Βελτιον δάκνεσθαι αὐτὴν [ψυχὴν] τῇ μνήμῃ νῦν, ἢ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν τῇ τιμωρίᾳ. Νῦν ἐὰν ᾖς αὐτῶν [ἁμαρτιῶν] μεμνημένος, καὶ συνεχῶς αὐτὰς προσφέρῃς τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν

thee not to bring thyself upon the stage, nor to accuse thyself unto others: but I advise thee to observe the Prophet's direction, reveal thy way unto the Lord, confess thy sins before God, confess them before the Judge; praying, if not with thy tongue, yet at least with thy memory; and so look to obtain mercy. It is better to be tormented with the memory of thy sins now, than with the torment that shall be hereafter. If you remember them now, and continually offer them to God, and pray for them, you shall quickly blot them out; but if you forget them now, you will then remember them against your will, when they shall be brought forth before the whole world, and be publicly exposed upon the stage before all, friends, enemies, and angels.' In another place[64], 'It is not necessary that thou shouldest confess in the presence of witnesses: let the inquiry after thy sins be made in thy own thoughts; let this judgment be without any witness; let God only see thee confessing.' Again[65], 'I beseech thee make thy confession continually to God. For I do not bring thee into the theatre of thy fellow-servants, neither do I constrain thee by any necessity to discover thy sins unto men. Unfold thy conscience before God, and show him thy wounds, and ask the cure of him. Show them to him, who will not reproach thee, but only heal thee. For although thou confess not, he knows all. Confess therefore, that thou mayest be a gainer. Confess, that thou mayest put off thy sins in this world, and go pure into the next, and avoid that intolerable publication that will

δέῃ, ταχέως ἐξαλείψεις αὐτάς. Ἐὰν δὲ νῦν ἐπιλάθῃ, τότε αὐτῶν ἀναμνησθήσῃ καὶ ἄκων, ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἁπάσης, εἰς μέσον φερομένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκπομπευομένων ἐπὶ πάντων, καὶ φίλων, καὶ ἐχθρῶν, καὶ ἀγγέλων.

[64] Hom. de Pœnitent. t. 5. Edit. Latin. [Serm. de Pœnitent. et Confess. (Basil. 1558. t. 5. fol. 901 a.) Sed confunderis et erubescis peccata tua effari ..... Nunc autem neque necessarium præsentibus testibus confiteri: cogitatione fiat delictorum exquisitio, absque teste sit hoc judicium. Solus te Deus confitentem videat. Deus, qui non exprobrat peccata tua, sed solvit peccata propter confusionem. Numquid et sic gravaris et retrocedis? Ed.]

[65] Hom. 30. sive Hom. 5. de Incomprehens. Dei Natur. t. 1. p. 392. (t. 1. p. 490 c.) .... *Παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι καὶ ἀντιβολῶ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ Θεῷ συνεχῶς· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς θέατρόν σε ἄγω τῶν συνδούλων τῶν σῶν, οὐδὲ ἐκκαλύψαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀναγκάζω τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. Τὸ συνειδὸς ἀνάπτυξον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ αὐτῷ δείξον τὰ τραύματα, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τὰ φάρμακα αἴτησον· δεῖξον τῷ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντι, ἀλλὰ θεραπεύοντι· κἂν γὰρ σιγήσῃς, οἶδεν ἐκεῖνος ἅπαντα. Εἰπὲ τοίνυν, ἵνα κερδάνῃς· εἰπὲ, ἵνα ἐνταῦθα ἀποθέμενος ἀπέλθῃς ἐκεῖ καθαρὸς καὶ ἔξω τῶν πλημμελημάτων, καὶ τῆς ἀφορήτου δημοσιεύσεως ἐκείνης ἀπαλλαγῇς.*

otherwise be made hereafter.' 'Why art thou ashamed and blushest,' says he, in another place[66], 'to confess thy sins? Dost thou discover them to a man, that he should reproach thee? Dost thou confess them to thy fellow-servant, that he should bring thee upon the open stage? Thou only showest thy wound to him who is thy Lord, thy Curator, thy Physician, and thy Friend. And he says to thee, I do not compel thee to go into the public theatre, and take many witnesses. Confess thy sin in private to me alone, that I may heal thy wound, and deliver thee from thy grief.' There are almost twenty passages[67] in the same author, very full and pregnant to the same purpose, which the learned reader may consult in their proper places, or view them at once collected together by Mr. Daille

[66] Hom. 4. de Lazar. t. 5. p. 87. (ibid. p. 757 d.) Τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκεν αἰσχύνῃ καὶ ἐρυθριᾷς, εἰπέ μοι, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα εἰπεῖν; μὴ γὰρ ἀνθρώπῳ λέγεις, ἵνα ὀνειδίσῃ σε; μὴ γὰρ τῷ συνδούλῳ ὁμολογεῖς, ἵνα ἐκπομπεύσῃ; τῷ δεσπότῃ, τῷ κηδεμόνι, τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ, τῷ ἰατρῷ τὸ τραῦμα ἐπιδεικνύεις. Μὴ γὰρ, κἂν σὺ μὴ εἴπῃς, ἐκεῖνος οὐκ οἶδεν, ὅσγε καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πραχθῆναι ἠπίστατο; Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν οὐ λέγεις; μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς σῆς κατηγορίας φορτικώτερον γίνεται τὸ ἁμάρτημα; ἡμερώτερον μὲν οὖν καὶ κουφότερον· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο βούλεταί σε εἰπεῖν, οὐχ ἵνα κολάσῃ, ἀλλ' ἵνα συγχωρήσῃ· οὐχ ἵνα αὐτὸς μάθῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν· πῶς γὰρ ὁ εἰδώς; ἀλλ' ἵνα σὺ μάθῃς, πόσον σοι συγχωρεῖ χρέος· βούλεται δέ σε μαθεῖν τῆς χάριτος τὸ μέγεθος, ἵνα εὐχαριστῶν διατελῇς, ἵνα ὀκνηρότερος πρὸς ἁμαρτίαν ᾖς, ἵνα προθυμότερος εἰς ἀρετήν· ἂν μὴ εἴπῃς τοῦ χρέους τὸ μέγεθος, οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκεις τῆς χάριτος τὴν ὑπερβολήν. Οὐκ ἀναγκάζω, φησὶν, εἰς μέσον ἐλθεῖν σε θέατρον, καὶ μάρτυρας περιστῆσαι πολλούς· ἐμοὶ τὸ ἁμάρτημα εἰπὲ μόνῳ κατ' ἰδίαν, ἵνα θεραπεύσω τὸ ἕλκος καὶ ἀπαλλάξω τῆς ὀδύνης.

[67] Hom. 57. Quod peccata non sint evulganda. t. 5. p. 754. (t. 3. p. 346 c.) Οὐ γὰρ εἰς μέσον ἄγοντες τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας οὕτω δημοσιεύομεν αὐτῶν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, κ. τ. λ.—Hom. 58. Non esse ad gratiam concionandum. t. 5. p. 772. (t. 2. p. 663 a.) ... Νυνὶ δὲ οὐδὲ ἀνάγκη παρόντων μαρτύρων ἐξομολογεῖσθαι.—Hom. 68. de Pœnitent. Ahab. t. 5. p. 1003. [Bened. Hom. de Pœnitent. 2.] (ibid. p. 287 b.) Εἰπὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἡμάρτηκα, κ. τ. λ.—Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. t. 1. p. 270. [Bened. Cateches. ad Illuminand. 2.] (ibid. p. 240 b.) Οὐδὲ ποιεῖ αὐτὰ [scil. ἁμαρτήματα] φανερὰ καὶ δῆλα, οὐδὲ ἀναγκάζει παρελθόντας εἰς μέσον ἐξειπεῖν τὰ πεπλημμελημένα· ἀλλ' αὐτῷ μόνῳ ἀπολογήσασθαι κελεύει, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξομολογήσασθαι.—Hom. 8. de Pœnitent. t. 1. p. 700. [Bened. Hom. 6.] (ibid. p. 326 b.) Οὐ περιέστησε μάρτυρας τῶν πλημμελημάτων. Ἔνδον εν τῷ συνειδότι, μηδενὸς παρόντος πλὴν τοῦ πάντα ὁρῶντος Θεοῦ, ποιοῦ τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων τὴν ἐξέτασιν.—Hom. 9. de Pœnitent. ibid. p. 708. [Bened. Hom. 3.] (ibid. pp. 294, seqq.)—Hom. 72. de Paralytic. t. 5. p. 927. (t. 3. pp. 32, seqq.) [Deest. in Edit. Savil.]—Hom. 20. in Gen. t. 2. p. 222. (t. 4. p. 175 b, c.) .... Καὶ μόνος αὐτῷ διαλεχθῆναι, μηδενὸς εἰδότος, καὶ πάντα εἰπεῖν· κ. τ. λ.—Hom. 2. in Ps. 50. t. 3. p. 1004. et p. 1005. (t. 5. [int. Spuria.] p. 589 c.) .... Ὅταν ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὴν κλίνην σου, καὶ μηδεὶς σοι διενοχλῇ, κ. τ. λ.—Hom. 20. in Matth. p. 200. [Bened. 19. al. 20.] (t. 7. p. 252 b.) .... Κελεύει περὶ τῆς τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τούτων ἀφέσεως προσιέναι τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ Θεῷ, κ. τ. λ.

in his excellent book of Auricular Confession[68], where he not only vindicates these passages of Chrysostom from the sophistical glosses and evasions of the Romanists, but also has unanswerably proved by no less than thirty arguments, and a cloud of other ancient witnesses, that there could be no such thing as private, auricular, sacramental confession enjoined as of necessity to pardon of sin, in the primitive Church.

But Chrysostom is not the only person that maintains this assertion.

St. Basil[69] says the same thing before him: 'I do not make confession with my lips, to appear to the world; but inwardly in my heart, where no eye sees; I declare my groanings unto thee alone, who seest in secret, I roar within myself: for I need not many words to make confession: the groanings of my heart are sufficient for confession, and the lamentations, which are sent up to thee, my God, from the bottom of my soul.'

In like manner St. Hilary[70] makes confession necessary to be made to God only: for commenting on the fifty-second Psalm, he tells us, 'David teaches us, that confession is necessary to be made to none but God, who hath made the olive fruitful with the hope of mercy for ever and ever.'

And St. Ambrose as plainly says, that tears poured out before God are sufficient to obtain pardon of sin, without confession made to man. His words are[71], 'Tears wash away sin, which men are ashamed to confess with their voice. Weeping provides at once both for pardon and bashfulness: tears speak our faults without horror; tears confess our crimes without any of-

—Hom. 28. in 1 Cor. p. 569. (t. 10. p. 250 e.) .... Καὶ οὐχ ἕτερον ἑτέρῳ κελεύει δοκιμάσαι, κ. τ. λ.—See also nn. 63, 65, and 66, preceding.

[68] L. 4. c. 25. (p. 474.) Argumentum vicesimum ex tredecim Chrysostomi testimoniis, &c.

[69] In Ps. 37, 8. (append. t. 1. part 2. p. 520 d. n. 4.) Οὐ γὰρ ἵνα τοῖς πολλοῖς φανερὸς γένωμαι, τοῖς χείλεσιν ἐξομολογοῦμαι· ἔνδον δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ καρδίᾳ τὸ ὄμμα μύων, σοὶ μόνῳ τῷ βλέποντι τὰ ἐν κρυπτῷ, τοὺς ἐν ἐμαυτῷ στεναγμοὺς ἐπιδεικνύω, ἐν ἐμαυτῷ ὠρυόμενος· οὐδὲ γὰρ μακρῶν μοι λόγων χρεία ἦν πρὸς τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν· ἀπήρκουν γὰρ οἱ στεναγμοὶ τῆς καρδίας μου πρὸς ἐξομολόγησιν, καὶ αἱ ἀπὸ βάθους ψυχῆς πρὸς σὲ τὸν Θεὸν ἀναπεμπόμενοι ὀδυρμοί.

[70] In Ps. 208. (t. 1. p. 93 a. n. 23.) .... Nulli alii docens confitendum, quam qui fecit olivam fructiferam spe misericordiæ in sæculum sæculi.

[71] L. 10. in Luc. 22. v. 57. (t. 1. p. 1523 a. n. 88.) Lavant lacrymæ delictum, quod pudor est voce confiteri. Et veniæ fletur consulunt et verecundiæ, &c.

fence to modesty and shamefacedness.' So again[72], speaking of St. Peter's tears, he says, 'I find not what Peter said, but I find that he wept: I read of his tears, but I read not of his satisfaction:' meaning, that verbal confession was not simply necessary to obtain pardon.

And in this sense St. Austin[73] expounding those words of the Psalmist, "I said I will pronounce (or declare) my own wickedness against myself unto the Lord, and so thou forgavest the iniquity of my heart," says, 'he had not yet pronounced it, but only promised that he would pronounce it, and yet God forgave him. He had not yet pronounced it, but only in his heart; his confession was not yet come to his mouth, yet God heard the voice of his heart: his voice was not yet in his mouth, but the ear of God was in his heart; which implies, that God accepts and pardons the penitent and contrite heart, even before any formal declaration is made by vocal confession either to God or man.' In another place[74] he speaks of confession as no ways necessary to be made to man: 'What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confessions, as though they could heal all my diseases?' He also frequently tells us, with all the rest of the ancient writers, that a great many of those, which the Romanists now call *mortal sins*, were daily pardoned upon no other confession but the fervent and devout use of that of the Lord's Prayer[75], "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us!" which evidently shows, that he did not believe auricular confession necessary for expiating all manner of mortal sins.

[72] Ibid. p. 157. (p. ead. a.) Non invenio quid dixerit Petrus; invenio quod fleverit. Lacrymas ejus lego; satisfactionem [ejus] non lego.

[73] In Ps. 31. Serm. s. Enarrat. 2. (t. 4. p. 179 f.) Dixi, ... *Pronuntiabo adversum me injustitiam meam Domino; et tu dimisisti impietatem cordis mei.* Non jam pronuntiat, promittit se pronuntiaturum; et ille jam dimittit. Attendite, fratres, magna res: dixit, *Pronuntiabo.* Non dixit, *Pronuntiavi, et tu dimisisti.* Dixit, *Pronuntiabo, et tu dimisisti;* quia eo ipso, quod dixit, *Pronuntiabo,* ostendit, quia nondum ore pronuntiaverat, sed corde pronuntiaverat. Hoc ipsum dicere *Pronuntiabo,* pronuntiare est: ideo *Et tu dimisisti impietatem cordis mei.* Confessio ergo mea ad os nondum venerat: Dixeram enim, *Pronuntiabo adversum me:* verumtamen Deus audivit vocem cordis mei. Vox mei in ore nondum erat, sed auris Dei jam in corde erat.

[74] Confess. l. 10. c. 3. (t. 1. p. 171 d.) Quid mihi ergo est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas, quasi ipsi sanaturi sint omnes languores meos?

[75] See this fully proved, b. 16. ch. 3. s. 14. v. 6. pp. 178–183. nn. 42, seqq.

Maximus Taurinensis[76] delivers his opinion almost in the same words as St. Ambrose does: 'Tears wash away sin, which the voice is ashamed to confess. Therefore tears provide at once both for men's modesty and salvation; they neither make men blush in their petitions, nor disappoint them of pardon in asking.' He adds, 'that tears are a sort of silent prayers: they ask not pardon in words, and yet deserve it; (that is, in his style, procure it;) they declare not the cause, and yet obtain mercy. Nay, the prayers of tears are many times of more advantage than those of words; because words often prove deceitful in prayer, but tears never deceive. For words sometimes declare but half the business; but tears always express the whole affection.'

Prosper[77], who was St. Austin's scholar, follows his doctrine: for, speaking of private sins committed by the clergy, he says, 'They shall more easily appease God, who being not convict by human judgment do of their own accord acknowledge their offence; who either do discover it by their own confessions, or else, others not knowing what they are in secret, do voluntarily inflict the sentence of excommunication upon themselves; and being separated, not in mind, but in office, from the altar, to which they did minister, do lament their life as dead; assuring themselves, that God being reconciled unto them by the fruits of effectual repentance, they shall not only receive what they have lost, but also being made citizens of that city which is above, they shall come to everlasting joys.'

Cassian also assures us, that this was the doctrine of the

[76] Hom. 3. de Pœnitentia Petri. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 6. p. 23. 9.) Lavat enim lacrymis delictum, quod voce pudor est confiteri. Lacrymæ ergo verecundiæ consulunt pariter et saluti; nec erubescunt in petendo, et impetrant in rogando. Lacrymæ, inquam, tacitæ quodammodo preces sunt; veniam non postulant, et merentur; causam non dicunt, et misericordiam consequuntur; nisi quod utiliores lacrymarum preces sunt, quam sermonum; quia sermo in precando forte fallit, lacryma omnino non fallit. Sermo enim interdum non totum profert negotium; lacryma semper totum prodit affectum.

[77] De Vit. Contemplat. l. 2. c. 7. (append. p. 31 a. 15.)... Deum sibi facilius placabunt illi, qui non humano convicti judicio, sed ultro crimen agnoscunt: qui aut propriis illud confessionibus produnt, aut nescientibus aliis, quales occulti sunt, ipsi in se voluntariæ excommunicationis sententiam ferunt, et ab altari cui ministrabant, non animo, sed officio separati, vitam suam tanquam mortuam plangunt, certi quod reconciliato sibi efficacis pœnitentiæ fructibus Deo, non solum amissa recipiant, sed etiam cives supernæ civitatis effecti, ad gaudia sempiterna perveniant.

Egyptian fathers; for he says[78], Pinuphius the Egyptian abbot gave this advice to the monks that were under him: 'Who is it that cannot humbly say, *I made my sin known unto thee, and my iniquity have I not hid;* that by this confession he may confidently adjoin that which follows, *and so thou forgavest the impiety of my heart.* But if shamefacedness so draw thee back, that thou blushest to reveal them before men; cease not by continual supplication to confess them unto him from whom they cannot be hid, and to say, I know my iniquity and my sin is against me always: to thee only have I sinned, and done evil before thee, whose custom is both to cure without publishing our shame, and to pardon sins without accusing or upbraiding.'

These are plain testimonies evidently showing, that the Ancients did not believe the necessity of auricular confession, or urge it as a thing absolutely necessary to absolution and salvation.

This proved further from the practice of the Ancients in denying all manner of absolution to some relapsing sinners, without excluding them from the mercy and pardon of God upon confession to him alone.

3. But besides this, the practice of the Ancients, in one particular case, does most irrefragably show, that they did not believe the necessity of auricular confession. For they allowed no second public penance to many relapsing sinners, nor ever gave them any manner of sacerdotal absolution to their lives' end: which shall be evidently demonstrated in the next chapter. Now the plain consequence of this is, that no penitential confession, either public or private, was taken from such, as made to man, in order to obtain sacerdotal absolution: yet still they exhorted them to repent in private, and make private confession of their sins to God, in hopes of obtaining mercy and pardon from him at the great day of retribution. It is confessed on all hands, that such relapsers never had the privilege to make their public confession in the church, in order to obtain public absolution: and it is as certain, they were not

[78] Collat. 20. c. 8. (p. 549.) Postremo quis est, qui non possit suppliciter dicere, *Peccatum meum cognitum tibi feci, et injustitiam meam non operui?* ut per hanc confessionem etiam illud confidenter subjungere mereatur, *Et tu remisisti impietatem cordis mei.* Quod si, verecundia retrahente, revelare [ea] coram hominibus erubescis, illi, quem latere non possunt, confiteri ea jugi supplicatione non desinas, ac dicere, *Iniquitatem meam ego cognosco, et peccatum meum contra me est semper: tibi soli peccavi, et malum coram te feci;* qui et absque illius verecundiæ publicatione curare, et sine improperio peccata donare consuevit.

admitted to compound by any private sacerdotal confession, to obtain private sacerdotal absolution. For, though Cardinal Perron[78] had a strong fancy to solve the difficulty of this argument, by feigning a sort of private confession for them, when they were denied the public, yet Petavius[79] himself refutes this

[78] [For a full and satisfactory account of James Davez Du Perron, see Chalmers' Biographical Dictionary, Lond. 1815. v. 14. pp. 350, seqq. He was born of Protestant parents, after their removal from Lower Normandy to the Canton of Berne, in 1556. In course of time he became a staunch Papist, writing, preaching, and disputing against the Reformed, and particularly against Du Plessis Mornay. He died at Paris, Sep. 8, 1618, aged 63. His works were collected afterwards, and were published at Paris, 1620–22, in 3 vols. fol., the first of which contain his elaborate Treatise on the Eucharist, against that of Du Plessis Mornay on the same subject. Ed.]

[79] Animadvers. in Epiphan. Hær. 59. (p. 237.) Ex quo perdifficilis exsistit quæstio, Quid illis tandem hominibus factum sit, qui post priorem pœnitentiam in eadem scelera rursus incurrerent; verumne sit, ab ecclesia rejectos illos penitus, nec ad privatam saltem aliquam receptum habuisse, cujus beneficio in integrum restituti ad divinorum mysteriorum communionem redirent. Qui antiquioris ecclesiæ formam ac consuetudinem ex hodiernis institutis et moribus æstimare voluerit, facile mitiorem in partem inclinabit; nec ab omni ecclesiæ sacramentorumque consortio repudiatos illos persuadere sibi poterit. Quam in sententiam copiose quidam nuper ita disseruit. Triplicem ait apud antiquos fuisse pœnitentiam; publicam unam ob publica peccata; alteram privatam ac secretam propter occulta; tertiam ob eadem occulta crimina publice susceptam. Hanc vero postremam non eum tantum habuisse fructum, ut peccatorum culpam ac sempiterni supplicii noxam abstergeret; sed ut temporarias insuper pœnas diluerit, ac peccatores in integrum cumulatissime restituerit. Proinde non ejus copiam promiscue esse factam, neque, quoties quisque peteret, facile permissam; sed in omni vita semel duntaxat. Hæc ille: ex quibus et ex iis, quæ consequenter disputat, velle istud videtur; istiusmodi criminum reos post priorem pœnitentiam ad privatam confugisse, ejusque beneficio nihilominus communionem assecutos esse. Sed ad veterum patrum testimonia ac priscæ illius ecclesiæ normam, et communem adeo sensum, animum adjicienti mihi, parum commode pleraque explicata videntur. Etenim si graviorum delictorum conscii citra publicam illam, quam antea suscepissent, pœnitentiam emergere, et ad communionem pacemque reverti alterius ac privatæ beneficio potuerint; nonne melior illorum, quam cæterorum, conditio fuit, quibus sine publica pœnitentia reditus in ecclesiam non patuit? Atqui nemo tam vecors erit, qui humanius cum illis actum putet, qui in eadem sæpius incurrissent, et quidem horrenda flagitia, quam cum eis, qui semel ea commisissent: quod ex illa opinione consequitur. Cujusmodi vero istud est; velut gratiæ, ac beneficii loco publicam illam pœnitentiam spisse ac difficiliter indultam? Nam si privata et occulta defungi possent, et in eodem ac cæteri loco esse; quis non tanto molestiarum ac temporis compendio mallet uti, cupidissimeque se, publica illa contempta, ad commodiorem alteram brevioremque transferret? Volo enim illud mihi respondeant: Qui atrocioris culpæ conscius tum primum ad pœnitentiam accederet, utrum absque publica per privatam restitui potuerit, an necessario usurpanda illa fuerit? Si prius dixerint; si, inquam, necessariam illis publi-

pretence, as a mere dream without any foundation in ancient history, and gives a solid reason to the contrary. For, as he argues, 'if private confession had been allowed to such relapsers, their condition had been happier, and their penance easier, than those who fell but once: which is a thing that will hardly enter into any man's imagination, that considers things with any manner of judgment and reason.' Supposing then the truth of this fact, that the Ancients allowed such relapsers neither the benefit of public nor private absolution upon any confession whatsoever: it evidently follows, that they did not believe in any absolute necessity for auricular confession, since they encouraged such sinners notwithstanding to hope for mercy and pardon upon private repentance and confession made to God only.

For the proof of which one passage of St. Austin [80] will be sufficient, where he speaks the general practice of the Church, and the sense of all his brethren. 'The iniquity of men,' says he, 'sometimes proceeds so far, that after they have done public penance, after they have been reconciled to the altar, they commit the same or greater sins; and yet God makes his sun to rise even upon such, and bestows upon them, no less than before, the greatest gifts of life and salvation. And though there be no place allowed to such in the Church, to perform that humble sort of penance again, yet God does not forget his

cam pœnitentiam negaverint, antiquitatis totius memoria teste refellentur. Siquidem vetera omnia Concilia, omnesque canonum conditores ita publicam lapsis pœnitentiam præscribunt, ac tempus rationemque definiunt; ita porro Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Pacianus, antiqui ad unum omnes eosdem illos hortando, comminando, objurgando vel invitos urgent, et impellunt; ut minime hoc illis integrum fuisse significent. Restat igitur, nullo ut alio, ac ne privatæ quidem pœnitentiæ subsidio, recipi in communionem ecclesiæ potuisse concedant. Quod quum dederint; tum de illis quid sentiant requiram, qui secundo in graviora peccata lapsi publica uti pœnitentia non poterant; ecquid eos censeant per privatam pœnitentiam reconciliari potuisse? Nam si istud asserant, necesse erit una fateantur, feliciorem multo conditionem eorum exstitisse, qui sæpius, quam eorum, qui semel in vita deliquissent. Quod quibus tandem persuadere poterunt?

[80] Ep. 54. [al. 153. c. 3.] ad Macedon. p. 92. (t. 2. p. 526 c.) In tantum autem hominum aliquando iniquitas progreditur, ut etiam post actam pœnitentiam, post altaris reconciliationem, vel similia vel graviora committant, et tamen Deus facit super tales oriri solem suum: nec minus tribuit quam ante tribuebat largissima munera vitæ ac salutis. Et quamvis eis in ecclesia locus humillimæ pœnitentiæ non concedatur; Deus tamen super eos suæ patientiæ non obliviscitur. Ex quorum numero si quis nobis dicat, Aut date mihi eundem iterum pœ-

patience toward them. But if any of these should say to us, Either grant me the same place of repentance again, or else suffer me to go on desperately, to live as I list, to do whatever my riches will enable me to do and no human laws will forbid me, to live in whoredom and all manner of luxury, which, though damnable before the Lord, is even laudable in the eyes of many men: or, if ye recall me from this wickedness, tell me whether it will profit me any thing towards eternal life, if in this life I contemn the blandishments of enticing pleasure, if I bridle the excitements of lust, if for the chastisement of my body I deny myself many things that are lawful and allowed, if I torment myself more vehemently in repentance than I did before, if I groan more miserably and weep more abundantly, if I live better, if I more liberally sustain the poor, if I flame more ardently in charity which covers a multitude of sins: which of us is so foolish as to say to this man, All this will profit thee nothing hereafter, go and enjoy the pleasures of this life? God forbid we should be guilty of so monstrous and sacrilegious madness. Therefore though it be a cautious and salutary rule and provision in the ecclesiastical law, that this place of the humblest penance shall not be granted above once in the Church, lest by making the medicine too vile and cheap,

nitendi locum, aut desperatum me permittite, ut faciam quidquid libuerit, quantum meis opibus adjuvor, et humanis legibus non prohibeor, in scortis omnique luxuria, damnabili quidem apud Dominum, sed apud homines plerosque etiam laudabili: aut si me ab hac nequitia revocatis, dicite, utrum mihi aliquid prosit ad vitam futuram: si in ista vita illecebrosissimæ voluptatis blandimenta contempsero, si libidinum incitamenta frænavero, si ad castigandum corpus meum multa mihi etiam licita et concessa subtraxero, si me pœnitendo vehementius quam prius excruciavero, si miserabilius ingemuero, si flevero uberius, si vixero melius, si pauperes sustentat vero largius, si caritate, quæ operit multitudinem peccatorum, flagravero ardentius; quis nostrum ita desipit, ut huic homini dicat, Nihil tibi ista proderunt in posterum; vade, saltem vitæ hujus suavitate perfruere? Avertat Deus tam immanem sacrilegamque dementiam. Quamvis ergo caute salubriterque provisum sit, ut locus illius humillimæ pœnitentiæ semel in ecclesia concedatur, ne medicina vilis minus utilis esset ægrotis, quæ tanto magis salubris est, quanto minus contemptibilis fuerit; quis tamen audeat dicere Deo, Quare huic homini, qui post primam pœnitentiam rursus se laqueis iniquitatis obstringit, adhuc iterum parcis? Quis audeat dicere erga istos non agi, quod Apostolus ait, *Ignorans, quia patientia Dei ad pœnitentiam te adducit?* Aut istis exceptis esse definitum quod scriptum est, *Beati omnes, qui confidunt in eum?* Aut ad istos non pertinere quod dicitur, *Viriliter agite, et confortetur cor vestrum, omnes qui speratis in Dominum?*

it should become less useful to those that are sick, being so much the more beneficial, by how much it is less contemptible: yet who dares to say to God, Why dost thou spare this man, who after his first penance binds himself again in the bonds of iniquity? Who dares say that God deals not with them according to that saying of the Apostle, "Knowest thou not that the long-suffering of God leadeth thee to repentance?" Or that they are excepted from that general declaration, "Blessed are all they that put their trust in him?" Or that it belongs not to them when it is said, "Be strong, and establish your heart, all ye that put your trust in the Lord?"'

If St. Austin here rightly represents the practice of the Church in this one case, there was no use made either of public or private confession to men to obtain the remission of the greatest sins; but men were directed to another method to seek pardon from God by the exercise of a private repentance. Consequently there could be no absolute necessity of auricular confession, which in this case had been most likely to have been prescribed in want of the other, had any such necessity been taught or laid upon it, as is now done by the imperious and dictating authority of the Church of Rome.

And from several other considerations of the like nature.

4. The learned Mr. Daille has urged many other considerations of great weight, which I cannot here insist upon, but only mention the heads of them, for the sake of the unlearned readers, or such of the learned as have not that excellent and elaborate work [81] of his by them.

1. He argues [82], from the practice of all other Churches in the world beside the Roman, that the doctrine of the necessity of auricular confession is taught by no other denomination of Christians, not the Ethiopians, nor the Indians of St. Thomas, nor the Babylonians or Chaldæans, nor the Armenians, nor the Jacobites, nor the Greeks, in the manner of the Romans. 2. He shows [83], that whereas the priests in the Roman Church are nicely instructed in the business of auricular confession, and teach and minister it daily to the people, as the noblest act of their office; there is nothing of all this to be found in the genuine writings of the ancient Christians. 3. Whereas

[81] De Confessione Auriculari. Genev. 1661. 4to.

[82] L. 4. c. 1. (p. 288.)

[83] Ibid. c. 2. (p. 292.)

auricular confession [84] is continually mentioned by the Roman writers among the religious acts of all sorts of men, clergy, monks, laity, princes, private men, noblemen, plebeians, men, women, &c., there is nothing of this among the ancient Christians. 4. In the ancient Church [85] Christians were bound by no law, as now they are in the Roman, to confess their sins to a priest before they came to the Lord's table to receive the eucharist. Which he demonstrates by eight reasons, and the testimony of Chrysostom, Pelagius, Austin, Dorotheus, the Council of Chalons and Hincmar. 5. In the Roman Church [86] it is usual for every one to make his auricular confession at the point of death; of which there are no footsteps among the Ancients. 6. The Romish writers [87] are very full of auricular confession in describing any of the sicknesses, or calamities, or wars, or shipwrecks, or journeys, or other hazardous undertakings of their people: but there was no such practice among the Ancients. 7. The Ancients [88], in describing the persecutions of the Church, or the conflicts and trials and last agonies of their confessors and martyrs, never mention auricular confession, which yet abounds every where in the Romish writers, when they make any such relations of the lives or deaths of their martyrs. 8. The Ancients [89] had no solemn times appointed for auricular confession, as Easter, Christmas, Lent, the greater festivals, and the Friday and Saturday fasts, which are now every where spoken of in the Romish writers as solemn times of confession. 9. The Ancients [90] say nothing of miracles done in or by confession, which the Romanists continually boast of. 10. The ancient Pagans [91] never objected auricular confession to the primitive Christians, as the modern Pagans do to those of the Roman communion. 11. The ancient Church [92] knew nothing of heretics opposing auricular confession, because there was no such thing enjoined; but since it was appointed by the Council of Lateran, anno 1215, many have been condemned as heretics for opposing it. 12. The primitive bishops [93] often declare that they were ignorant of the

[84] Ibid. c. 3. (p. 310.)
[85] Ibid. c. 4. (p. 322.)
[86] Ibid. c. 5. (p. 336.)
[87] Ibid. c. 6. (p. 347.)
[88] Ibid. c. 7. (p. 358.)
[89] Ibid. c. 8. (p. 369.)
[90] Ibid. c. 9. (p. 374.)
[91] Ibid. c. 10. (p. 384.)
[92] Ibid. c. 11. (p. 387.)
[93] Ibid. c. 12. (p. 393.)

sins of their people: particularly this is said by Chrysostom and Austin, and by Innocent and Leo, bishops of Rome; which is an argument that they were not revealed to them by sacramental confession. 13. The first man[94] that instituted any private confession was St. Anthony, who appointed his monks to write down their thoughts, and communicate them one to another: but this was nothing to sacerdotal confession; for these monks were only laymen. 14. The ancient writers[95] have none of those intricate questions and disputations about auricular confession, which so much stuff the books of the modern casuists in the Church of Rome. 15. The Fathers[96] never interpret those passages of Scripture, which the Romanists produce for auricular confession, in their sense, but most of them to a contrary meaning. 16. The Fathers[97] in those Books which they wrote professedly of repentance, never urge auricular confession as a necessary part of repentance. 17. The Fathers[98] acknowledged only three sorts of repentance; the ante-baptismal, for all manner of sins; the quotidian or daily repentance, for lesser sins of daily incursion; and the public penance of lapsers falling into more heinous sins: but auricular confession appertains to none of these. 18. Gregory Nyssen[99] says expressly there were some sins, such as covetousness, which the Fathers before him endeavoured to cure, not by any canonical punishments, but only by the public exhortations of the word and doctrine; which will not consist with the doctrine of auricular confession. 19. Nectarius[1] wholly abrogated the office

[94] Ibid. c. 13. (p. 398.)
[95] Ibid. c. 14. (p. 401.)
[96] Ibid. c. 15. (p. 403.)
[97] Ibid. c. 16. (p. 416.)
[98] Ibid. c. 17. (p. 418.)
[99] Ibid. c. 23. (p. 458.) [Argumentum octodecimum ex insigni quodam Gregorii Nysseni testimonio ductum. Is enim cum observasset peccata avaritiæ, quæ ab Apostolo *et idololatria et omnium malorum radix* dicatur, *παρωφθῆναι ἀνεπίσκεπτά τε καὶ ἀπημελητὰ, inconsiderata et absque cura prætermissa esse a patribus*, hoc est, ut optime interpretatur Balsamo, relicta esse *ἀνεπιτίμητά τε καὶ ἀκόλαστα, impunita et incastigata*, nullis adeo pœnitentiæ censuris pœnisque subjecta; postquam hoc, inquam, observavit, continenter addit: (ex Ep. ad Letoium, c. 5. Vid. ap. CC. t. 2. p. 1788 d, e.) Ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων διὰ τὸ παρεῖσθαι τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν, ἀρκεῖν ἡγούμεθα τῷ δημοσίῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγῳ, ὅπως ἂν οἷόν τε ᾖ θεραπεύειν, ὥσπερ τινὰ πληθωρικὰ, τὰς πλεονεκτικὰς ἀρρωστίας διὰ τοῦ λόγου καθαίροντες.... Locus palmarius; qui totum confessionis Innocentianæ mysterium illo sæculo, id est, quarto pœne præcipiti, ecclesiæ Christianæ adhuc incognitum fuisse, plane liquidoque demonstrat. *Grischov.*]
[1] Ibid. c. 24. (p. 461.)

of the penitentiary priest; which argues that there was no necessity of auricular confession: but of this office we must speak a little more particularly hereafter. 20. His next argument[2] is drawn from those passages of Chrysostom, Hilary, Basil, Ambrose, Maximus Taurinensis, and St. Austin, which have been already mentioned, asserting that remission of sins may be obtained of God by contrition only, without any oral confession. 21. The Fathers[3] allow salvation to be attainable even by those relapsers who fell again into sin after their first public penance, though they had no liberty either to make confession or receive absolution: which argument has been particularly explained already. His 22nd, 23rd, and 24th arguments[4] are drawn from the testimonies of Cassian, and Julianus Pomerius or Prosper, and Laurentius Novariensis; which have been related before. 25. To these he adds[5] two considerable testimonies of Bede. 26. And the concessions[6] of Erasmus, Beatus Rhenanus, and Rigaltius, who freely own that the Romish auricular confession was not in use in the primitive Church. 27. He shows[7] that there was a change made of the ancient discipline in the ninth age, when private penance enjoined by the priest began to be pretty frequent and common. 28. And yet this differed[8] vastly in many particulars from the confession established afterwards in the Council of Lateran: for still it was believed that confession made to God only was sufficient to salvation. 29. In the following ages also, Goffridus Vindocinensis[9], Peter Lombard[10],

[2] Ibid. c. 33. (p. 512.)
[3] Ibid. c. 34. (p. 515.)
[4] Ibid. cc. 35–37. (pp. 517, 528, 531.)
[5] Ibid. c. 38. (p. 533.)
[6] Ibid. c. 39. (p. 536.)
[7] Ibid. c. 40. (p. 538.)
[8] Ibid. c. 42. (p. 545.)
[9] L. 5. Ep. 16. ibid. c. 43. (p. 553.) Ex Goffrido Vindocinensi supra [p. 534.] recitavimus, fuisse eo tempore (id est, undecimo desinente, vel ineunte duodecimo sæculo), Guilielmum quendam, virum doctum, qui diceret, *Solummodo quatuor peccata confessione indigere, errorem videlicet Gentilem, schisma fraternum, hæreticam pravitatem, et Judaicam perfidiam;* quod iis universalis ecclesiæ castitas commaculetur; *cætera autem peccata a Domino sine confessione sanari.*
[10] Distinct. l. 4. n. 17. ap. Dall. ibid. (p. 554.) Is enim proposita hac quæstione, *Utrum sufficiat peccata confiteri soli Deo, an oporteat confiteri sacerdoti,* hæc statim subjicit, *Quibusdam visum est, sufficere, si soli Deo fiat confessio sine judicio sacerdotali et confessione ecclesiæ.* Mox istorum fundamenta ex Scripturis et Patribus exponit; tum, *His,* inquit, *auctoritatibus innituntur, qui sufficere contendunt Deo confiteri peccata sine sacerdote. Dicunt enim, quod si quis timens detegere culpam*

and Gratian [11], say there were many who still held that confession to God alone was sufficient without confessing to the priest. And Gratian [12] particularly, having cited the authorities on both sides of the question, leaves it to the judgment of the reader to take which opinion he pleases: because each opinion had wise and religious men to authorize and defend it. Which argues that in Gratian's time the question about the necessity of auricular confession was not so determined as it was afterwards in the Council of Lateran and the Council of Trent. This is also acknowledged by Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Antonine, who say [13] that in the time of Gratian and Lombard, the question about the necessity of such confession was only problematical, and what might safely be disputed both ways, and that it was no heresy to deny it: but after the determination of the Church made under Innocent III, in the Lateran Council, it was to be reputed heresy for any man to assert that it was sufficient to confess a man's sins to God without making confession to a priest also. 30. Thus the doctrine of auricular confession was established in the thirteenth century [14], and not before: and even after that there wanted not witnesses, such as Wickliffe, and Huss, and Semeca, and Michael of Bononia, and Petrus Oxoniensis, to bear testimony against its novelty, to the time of the Reformation.

This is the short account of those thirty arguments which the learned Mr. Daille uses to show the novelty of the Romish doctrine concerning auricular confession, which the curious reader, who desires to see them more fully deduced and confirmed, may consult in our author's elaborate work for his further satisfaction.

Yet private confession allowed and

5. But in all that is said by this or any other Protestant writer, there is no intent to deny that private confession was

suam apud homines, ne inde opprobrio habeatur, vel alii suo exemplo ad peccandum accingantur, et ideo tacet homini et revelat Deo, consequitur veniam, &c.

[11] De Pœnitent. distinct. 2. c. 89. ap. Dall. ibid. (p. 555.) Ait esse qui dicunt quemlibet criminis veniam sine confessione ecclesiæ, et sacerdotali judicio posse promereri.

[12] Annot. in loc. citat. (Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 1. p. 1717. 74.) .... Cui harum potius adhærendum sit, lectoris judicio reservatur. Utraque enim fautores habet sapientes et religiosos viros.

[13] Dall. ibid. (pp. 556, 557.) Sed ut ad rem redeam, &c.

[14] Ibid. c. 44. (p. 558.)

encouraged in some cases. As, 1. For lesser sins men were advised to confess mutually to one another, to have their prayers and assistance.

allowed and encouraged by the Ancients in some cases, and upon some special occasions. For,

1. They advised all men, in case of lesser sins, to make confession mutually to one another, that they might have each other's prayers and assistance. This is the advice of St. James (5, 16.) "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed. The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Which though it be a place commonly produced by the Romanists for their auricular confession to a priest, yet it was anciently thought no more than a direction to Christians in general to confess their sins mutually to one another. Thus, it is certain, St. Austin understood it; for writing upon those words of our Saviour in St. John[15], [13, 14.] "If I your Lord and Master have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet," he thus expounds them and the words of St. James together: 'Can we say, that one brother may cleanse another from the contagion of sin? Yes, we are taught to do it by the mystical meaning of this work of our Lord, that we should confess our sins one to another, and pray one for another, as Christ intercedes for us. Let us hear St. James the Apostle, evidently commanding this very thing, and saying, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another," because in this our Lord hath set us an example. For, if he, who neither has, nor ever had, nor ever will have any sin, prays for our sins, how much rather ought we to pray for the sins of one another! And, if he forgive us, who has nothing to be forgiven by us, how much more ought we to forgive one another, who cannot live here without sin! Let us therefore forgive one another, and pray

[15] Tractat. 58. in Ioan. t. 9. p. 164. (t. 2. part. 2. p. 662 b, c.) Numquid dicere possumus, quod etiam frater fratrem a delicti poterit contagione mundare? Immo vero id etiam nos esse admonitos in hujus Dominici operis altitudine noverimus, ut confessi invicem delicta nostra oremus pro nobis, sicut et Christus interpellat pro nobis. Audiamus Apostolum Jacobum, hoc ipsum evidentissime præcipientem et dicentem, *Confitemini invicem delicta vestra et orate pro vobis:* quia et ad hoc Dominus nobis dedit exemplum. Si enim ille, qui ullum peccatum nec habet nec habuit nec habebit, orat pro peccatis nostris, quanto magis nos invicem pro peccatis nostris orare debemus? Et si dimittit nobis ille, cui non habemus quod dimittamus, quanto magis dimittere nobis debemus invicem, qui sine peccato hic vivere non valemus. . . . Invicem itaque nobis delicta donemus, et pro nostris delictis invicem oremus, atque ita quodam modo pedes nostros lavemus.

for each other's sins, that so we may in some measure wash one another's feet.' In like manner Eradius[16], or St. Austin himself in another place[17] says, 'We are admonished throughout the whole Scripture to confess our sins continually and humbly, not only to God, but to holy men and those that fear God. For so the Holy Ghost teaches us by James the Apostle, saying, "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed."

Hincmar, a learned French bishop of the ninth age, gives the same interpretation: 'Our light and daily sins,' says he[18], 'according to the exhortation of St. James, are daily to be confessed to those that are our equals: and such sins we may believe will be cleansed by their daily prayers, and our own acts of piety, if with a charitable mind we truly say in the Lord's Prayer, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us."' And Maldonat[19] says, this was the

[16] [Or *Eraclius*. See b. 2. ch. 7. s. 5. v. 1. p. 109. n. 26. Ed.]

[17] Hom. 12. ex. 50. t. 10. p. 161. [al. Serm. 253. append.] (t. 5. p. 415 b.) In omnibus Scripturis divinis ... utiliter ac salubriter admonemur, ut peccata nostra debeamus jugiter et humiliter non solum Deo, sed etiam sanctis et Deum timentibus, confiteri. Sic enim per Jacobum Apostolum nos admonet Spiritus Sanctus, dicens, *Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra, et orate pro invicem, ut salvemini.*

[18] Ep. 40. ad Hildebold. (t. 2. p. 688.) Quotidiana autem leviaque peccata, secundum Jacobi Apostoli hortamentum, alterutrum coæqualibus confitenda sunt. Quæ quotidiana eorum oratione cum quotidianis piis actibus credenda sunt mundari, si cum benignitate mentis in oratione Dominica veraciter dicitur, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos remittimus debitoribus nostris.*

[19] De Confess. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 36.) Illud vero quod ait Jacobus, c. 10. *Confitemini alterutrum peccata vestra*, non videtur de confessione sacramentali intelligendum esse, nec esse necessarium. Primum, quia, cum dicit *alterutrum*, indicat se loqui de ea confessione, quæ sit inter omnes Christianos, etiam laicos, ad petendum alterius consilium et orationes. Deinde, quod addit, idem significat, *Orate pro invicem.* Nam de iisdem loquitur, cum ait, *Confitemini alterutrum*, et cum ait, *Orate pro invicem.* Cum autem dicit, *Orate pro invicem*, non loquitur de solis sacerdotibus, sed de omnibus; ergo et cum dicit, *Confitemini alterutrum.* Præterea Græce est ὅπως ἰαθῆτε, id est, *ut curemini et a morbo liberemini.* Ex quo verbo intelligitur, non esse sermonem de ea confessione, quæ fit sacerdotibus ad obtinendam remissionem peccatorum, sed ea, quæ fit omnibus Christianis ad obtinendas preces. Idem colligitur ex eo, quod sequitur, *Multum valet oratio justi assidua:* ubi non tantum loquitur de justo sacerdote, sed de quolibet justo, ut declarat exemplum illud; *Elias homo erat similis nobis, passibilis; oratione oravit, ut non plueret, &c.* Ad hunc modum omnes fere veteres intellexerunt eum locum: Hesychius, l. 1. in Levit. c. 4.; D. Augustinus, Hom. 12. ex 50.; D. Gregorius, lib. 22. Moral. c. 14.; Beda, Commentario in eundem locum et in 1 Ioan. c. 5.; et Auctor Glossæ Interlinearis.

sense of all the Ancients, alleging not only St. Austin, but Hesychius, and Gregory the Great, and Bede, and the author of the Interlineary Gloss: to which others[20] add Scotus, and Biel, and Dionysius Carthusianus, and Cajetan, and Gagnæus, and Godellus, a late bishop in the French Church. Bellarmin, however, fixes upon this passage of St. James as a plain proof of auricular confession to a priest, which, in the case mentioned, according to the opinion of so many Ancients and Moderns, directs to no other confession but what may be made to any pious Christian.

2. In case of injuries done to private persons, men were obliged to confess, and ask pardon of the injured party.

6. In case of private injuries done to any private person, there was no question ever made, but that the offending party might make a private confession of his fault to the offended party and give him private satisfaction. For so Christ had appointed: (Matth. 5, 23.) "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Upon which St. Austin[21] says, 'A man may with an unfeigned heart endeavour to pacify and appease him by asking him pardon, if he does this before God. Nay, it is his only remedy in this case to ask pardon; which whoever does not, he is puffed up with the spirit of vain-glory.'

3. When they were under any troubles of conscience, they were advised to make private confession to a minister, to have his counsel and direction.

7. When men were under any perplexities of mind, or troubles of conscience from the pressure and load of sin; that was another case, in which they were always directed to have recourse to some wise and prudent pastor, to take his counsel and advice, and his assistance, and his prayers, as a sort of mediator and intercessor under Christ for them. The Romish writers are apt to allege many passages out of the Ancients, which upon examination and strict inquiry amount to no more than this. Thus Clemens Romanus[22], or the author under his

[20] Vid. Dallæum, de Confess. Auricular. l. 1. c. 12. (pp. 72, 73.)—[Biel is there cited by his Christian name *Gabriel*: (p. 72.) Scotum in his, ut fere in aliis, Gabriel sequitur, &c. Ed.]

[21] De Serm. Dom. in Mont. l. 1. c. 10. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 176 e, f.) Poteris eum [scil. fratrem] non stimulato animo lenire, atque in gratiam revocare, veniam postulando, si hoc prius coram Deo feceris.... Quod est unum remedium, supplici animo veniam deprecetur: quod quisquis non fecerit, inanis jactantiæ spiritu inflatur. [Nisi quisquis inanis jactantiæ spiritu non inflatur. *Ed. Bened.*]

[22] Ep. 1. ad Jacob. n. 11. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 613.) Quod si forte alicujus

name, bids every one, 'into whose heart either envy, or infidelity, or any such crime, has slily crept, not be ashamed, if he has any care of his soul, to confess his sin to the bishop or minister presiding over him; that by the word of God and his saving counsel he may be healed.' And so Maldonat[23] owns this has no relation to sacramental confession. The same advice is given by Origen[24], Gregory Nyssen[25], and St. Basil[26], upon the like occasion, 'to confess their sins to the priest, who by his compassion and skilfulness was able to help their infirmities, and at once take care both of their credit and cure.'

4. To take his advice also, whether it was proper to do public penance fo private offences.

8. Origen gives another reason for confessing private sins to the priest, because he was best able to judge whether it were proper for such sins to admit men to do public penance in the church, which in those days was no unusual practice. 'Consider,' says he[27], 'what the Holy Scripture teaches us, that

cor vel livor, vel infidelitas, vel aliquod malum .... latenter irrepserit; non erubescat, qui animæ suæ curam gerit, confiteri hæc huic, qui præest, ut ab ipso per verbum Dei et consilium salubre curetur.

[23] De Confess. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 40.) Unus [nempe confessionis finis] erat, ut peccatores peterent consilium a confessario. Hoc est, quod scribit Clemens Epist. 1. D. Petrum docuisse, ut peccatores exponerent sacerdoti suas cogitationes malas, ut ab illo acciperent remedium; et quod Dionysius Areopagita indicat in epistola ad Demophilum, reprehendens Demophilum, quia calce abjecerat peccatorem accedentem ad presbyterum, ut ab illo peteret remedium peccatorum.

[24] See n. 27, following.

[25] De Pœnitent. (t. 2. p. 176 b.) .... *Δεῖξον αὐτῷ ἀνερυθριάστως τὰ κεκρυμμένα, γύμνωσον τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπόρρητα, κ. τ. λ.*

[26] Regul. Brev. Respons. 229. (t. 2. part. 2. p. 701 c.) *Ἡ ἐξαγόρευσις τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν λόγον, ὃν ἔχει ἡ ἐπίδειξις τῶν σωματικῶν παθῶν· ὡς οὖν τὰ πάθη τοῦ σώματος οὐ πᾶσιν ἀποκαλύπτουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὔτε τοῖς τυχοῦσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐμπείροις τῆς τούτων θεραπείας· οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐξαγόρευσις τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων γίνεσθαι ὀφείλει ἐπὶ τῶν δυναμένων θεραπεύειν, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ὑμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζετε, τουτέστιν, αἴρετε διὰ τῆς ἐπιμελείας.*

[27] Hom. 2. in Ps. 37. [n. 6.] t. 1. p. 471. (t. 2. p. 688 f.) Vide ergo quid edocet nos Scriptura divina, quia oportet peccatum non celare intrinsecus. Fortassis enim, sicut ii, qui habent intus inclusam escam indigestam, aut humoris vel phlegmatis stomacho graviter et moleste immanentis abundantiam, si vomuerint, relevantur; ita etiam hi, qui peccaverunt, siquidem occultant, et retinent intra se peccatum, intrinsecus urgentur, et propemodum suffocantur a phlegmate, vel humore peccati. Si autem ipse sui accusator fiat, dum accusat semet ipsum et confitetur, simul evomit et delictum, atque omnem morbi digerit causam. Tantummodo circumspice diligentius, cui debeas confiteri peccatum tuum. Proba prius medicum, cui debeas causam languoris exponere, qui sciat infirmari cum infirmante, flere cum flente; qui condolendi et compatiendi noverit disciplinam: ut ita demum, si quid ille dixerit, qui se prius et eruditum medicum ostenderit et misericordem, si quid consilii dederit, facias et sequaris.

we ought not to conceal our sin within our own breast. For perhaps as they, who are inwardly oppressed with the humour or phlegm of indigested meat, which lies heavy upon the stomach, if they vomit it up, are relieved; so they, who have sinned, if they hide and conceal their sin within themselves, are inwardly oppressed, and almost suffocated with the phlegm and humour of sin: but if any one become his own accuser, and confess his sin, in so doing he as it were vomits up his sin, and digests and removes the cause of his distemper. Only be circumspect in the choice of him, to whom it will be fit to confess thy sin. Try first the physician, to whom thou art to reveal the cause of thy distemper, and see that he be one, who knows how to be weak with him that is weak, and to weep with him that weeps; one who understands the discipline of condoling and compassionating; that so at length, if he shall say any thing, who hath first shown himself to be both a skilful and a merciful physician, and give thee any counsel, thou mayest observe and follow it. If he discerns and foresees thy distemper to be such as will need to be declared and cured in the full assembly of the Church, whereby others perhaps may be edified, and thou thyself healed, this is to be done with great deliberation, and the prudent advice of such a physician.'

It is very plain, that in this case this sort of private confession was made in order to take the minister's advice concerning doing public penance for any private sin; and that men had recourse to him in private, as to one who was best able to judge whether their sin were of such a nature as would require a public humiliation and repentance. For this, as I said before, was no unusual thing in those days, for men sometimes to desire to do public penance for private offences; yea, even for the very intention and design of some grosser sins, though they never proceeded so far as the outward action. Cyprian[28]

Si intellexerit et præviderit, talem esse languorem tuum, qui in conventu totius ecclesiæ exponi debeat et curari, ex quo fortassis et cæteri ædificari poterunt, et tu ipse facile sanari, multa hoc deliberatione et satis perito medici illius consilio procurandum est.

[28] De Lapsis. p. 134. (p. 95.) Denique quanto et fide majores et timore meliores sunt, qui quamvis nullo sacrificii aut libelli facinore constricti, quoniam tamen de hoc vel cogitaverunt, hoc ipsum apud sacerdotes Dei dolenter et simpliciter confitentes, exomologesin conscientiæ faciunt, animi sui pondus exponunt, salutarem medelam parvis licet et modicis vulneribus exquirunt; scientes scriptum esse, Deus non deridetur.

speaks of some such offenders, who 'reckoned themselves guilty of idolatry, not because they had either actually sacrificed to idols, or procured any libel to signify their so doing, but only because they had designed in their hearts to do it: who therefore confessed their wicked intention to the priests, in order to do public penance for it, though it was but a small sin in comparison, as knowing that it was written, "God is not mocked."' These private sins after secret confession were sometimes publicly declared and read out of a libel in the congregation: but all bishops did not approve of this practice: and therefore when Pope Leo understood that several bishops in the provinces of Campania, Samnium, and Picenum, took this method, he wrote a sharp letter[29] to them, complaining of it as 'an unlawful usurpation and irregular practice, to put those who made secret confession to the priests, upon a public rehearsal of their crimes afterwards in the face of the congregation: which custom ought by all means to be abrogated and laid aside. For though it may seem a very laudable plenitude of faith, that, for the fear of God, makes men not afraid to take shame before men; yet because all men's sins, which come under penance, are not such as they are not afraid to have made public, this unreasonable custom ought to be altered, lest

[29] Ep. 80. al. 78. (CC. t. 3. p. 1373 e.) Illam etiam contra apostolicam regulam præsumptionem, quam nuper agnovi a quibusdam illicita usurpatione committi, modis omnibus constituo submoveri, ne de singulorum peccatorum genere libellis scripta professio publice recitetur, cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta, &c.—Conf. Basil. Can. 61. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 217. Canonic. Tert.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1749 c.) Ὁ κλέψας, εἰ μὲν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ μεταμεληθεὶς κατηγορήσει ἑαυτοῦ, ἐνιαυτὸν κωλυθήσεται μόνον τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν ἁγιασμάτων.—C. 63. (ibid. d.) Ὁ ἐν ἀλόγοις τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσέβειαν ἐξαναγορεύων, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐξομολογούμενος παραφυλάττεται.—Paulin. de Vit. Ambros. p. 10. (t. 2. præfix. append. p. 10 f. n. 39.) Quotiescunque illi aliquis ob percipiendam pœnitentiam lapsus suos confessus esset, ita flebat, ut et illum flere compelleret; videbatur enim sibi cum jacente jacere. Causas autem criminum, quæ illi confitebatur, nulli nisi Domino soli, apud quem intercedebat, loquebatur: bonum relinquens exemplum posteris sacerdotibus, ut intercessores apud Deum magis sint, quam accusatores apud homines, &c.—Ambros. de Pœnitent. l. 1. c. 16. (ibid. p. 414 a. n. 90.) Si quis igitur, occulta crimina habens, propter Christum tamen studiose pœnitentiam egerit, quomodo ista recipit, si ei communio non refunditur? &c.—Gennad. de Dogmat. Eccles. c. 53. [Ed. Bened. c. 23.] (int. Oper. Augustin. t. 8. append. p. 78 d.) .... Quem mortalia crimina post baptismum commissa premunt, hortor prius publica pœnitentia satisfacere, et ita sacerdotis judicio reconciliatum communioni sociari, &c.

many should be driven from the remedy of repentance, whilst either they are ashamed or afraid to have their actions laid open before their enemies, who perhaps might take occasion from thence to bring them into danger of the civil laws, and the penalties imposed by them upon such offences.' Which last words of Leo suggest a further reason why the Ancients in some cases allowed of private confession, even when penance itself in its exercise was to be public.

5. When there was any danger of death arising from the laws of the State against certain offences.

9. For we may observe, that when there was any apparent danger to men's lives or otherwise, arising from the penalties of the civil laws, inflicting capital punishments on certain offences; in that case the Church was content to take a private confession of sinners, and excuse them from a dangerous publication. It is of this case St. Austin speaks, when[30] he says, 'We ought to correct secret sins in secret, lest if we publicly reprove them, we betray the man. We would reprove and correct him: but what if an enemy lies upon the catch, to hear something for which he may punish him? A bishop, (put the case,) perhaps knows a man to be a murderer, and besides himself no one else knows it: I would publicly rebuke the man, but then you would seek to take the law upon him. In this case I neither betray the man nor neglect him: I reprove him in secret; I set before his eyes the judgment of God; I terrify his bloody conscience, and persuade him to repentance.' It happened also that sometimes persons confessed such secret sins, as though they would not endanger their lives by a regular course of law, yet might provoke an injured party, if he knew them, in a sudden fit of zeal and passion to destroy them. In this case it was thought more proper to let the confession and penance be both in private, lest any such inconvenience might follow upon the publication. St. Basil[31] instances in the

[30] Serm. 16. de Verb. Dom. [al. Serm. 82.] c. 8. (t. 5. p. 444 e.) In secreto debemus corripere, in secreto arguere: ne volentes publice arguere, prodamus hominem. Nos volumus corripere et corrigere: quid si inimicus quærit audire quod puniat? Novit enim nescio quem homicidam episcopus, et alius illum nemo novit. Ego volo publice corripere, at tu quæris inscribere. Prorsus nec prodo, nec negligo: corripio in secreto; pono ante oculos Dei judicium; terreo cruentam conscientiam; persuadeo pœnitentiam.

[31] C. 34. [Oper. Basil. Ep. 199. Canonic. Secund.] (CC. t. 2. p. 1741 a.) Τὰς μοιχευθείσας γυναῖκας, καὶ ἐξαγορευούσας δι' εὐλάβειαν, ἢ ὁπωσοῦν ἐλεγχομένας, δημοσιεύειν μὲν ἐκώλυσαν [al. οὐκ ἐκέλευσαν] οἱ

case of a woman, that confesses herself guilty of adultery: the law allowed not the husband to kill her, except he took her in the very act: but it might happen, that in his zeal and fury he might be tempted even against law to kill her, if by any means he came to understand that she had been guilty of such a transgression: therefore to avoid the occasion of any such temptation, it was ordered, 'that no minister should δημοσιεύειν, *publish* the crime of women under penance for adultery upon their own confession, lest it should occasion their death;' that is, expose them to the fury of their husbands, who might be inclined, in the height of passion, to exceed all bounds and do what by law they could not answer.

6. Private confession required in case of private admonition for offences.

10. I remember but one case more, in which any thing like private confession was required; and that was, when any man was rebuked for a crime by his spiritual guide, of which he was either notoriously guilty, or violently suspected: in that case it was his duty to give glory to God, and take shame to himself, by an ingenuous confession and acknowledgment of his fault, to answer the true end of private admonition. It is of this sort of confession St. Ambrose speaks in the person of David[32], when he says, 'that being rebuked by a private man for his great offence, he did not fret and fume with indignation, but ingenuously confessed his fault and mourned with sorrow for it.'

The office of the penitentiary priest set up in many Churches to receive and regulate such private confessions.

11. All these sorts of private confession were anciently allowed of, as consistent with the standing and ordinary discipline of public confession and penance in the Church. And the better to regulate them, and direct men what to do in such cases, there was a particular officer appointed in many Churches under the name of *the penitentiary priest:* whose office was not to receive private confessions in prejudice to the public discipline; much less to grant absolution privately upon bare confession before any penance was performed; which was a practice altogether unknown to the ancient Church, as we shall see more hereafter[33]. But it was to facilitate and promote

πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ θανάτου αἰτίαν παράσχωμεν ἐλεγχθείσαις.—See before, b. 16. ch. 3. s. 2. v. 6. p. 126. n. 4.

[32] De Apolog. David. c. 2. (t. 1. p. 677 c. n. 5.) .... Cum a privato homine corriperetur, quod graviter deliquisset, non indignatus infremuit, sed confessus ingemuit culpæ dolore.

[33] See b. 19. ch. 2. s. 1. p. 188, following.

the exercise of public discipline, by acquainting men what sins the laws of the Church required to be expiated by public penance, and how they were to behave themselves in the performance of it; and only to appoint private penance for such private crimes as were not proper to be brought upon the public stage, either for fear of doing harm to the penitent himself, or giving scandal to the Church.

This office afterwards abrogated, and men were entirely left to their liberty as to what concerned private confession.

12. The whole history of the first original and institution of this office in the time of the Decian persecution, and the abrogation of it by Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, in the time of Theodosius, is entirely owing to the relation of Socrates and Sozomen, two historians, who lived in the same age that the office was abolished; and therefore it will be proper to relate it in their words first, and then make a few remarks upon it.

Socrates[33], speaking of the reign of Theodosius, says, 'About this time it was thought proper to remove the *peniten-*

[33] L. 5. c. 19. (v. 1. p. 285. 38.) Ὑπὸ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἔδοξε καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας περιελεῖν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, δι' αἰτίαν τοιαύτην. Ἀφ' οὗ Ναυατιανοὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διεκρίθησαν, τοῖς ἐπταικόσιν ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ Δεκίου διωγμῷ κοινωνῆσαι μὴ θελήσαντες, οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι τὸν πρεσβύτερον τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας προσέθεσαν, ὅπως ἂν οἱ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα πταίσαντες ἐπὶ τοῦ προβληθέντος τούτου πρεσβυτέρου ἐξομολογῶνται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα. Οὗτος ὁ κανὼν κρατεῖ μέχρι νῦν ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις αἱρέσεσι· μόνοι δὲ οἱ τοῦ ὁμοουσίου φρονήματος, καὶ οἱ τούτοις κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὁμόφρονες Ναυατιανοὶ, τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερον παρῃτήσαντο· Ναυατιανοὶ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὴν προσθήκην ταύτην ἐδέξαντο. Οἱ δὲ νῦν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν κρατοῦντες, ἕως πολλοῦ φυλάξαντες, ἐπὶ Νεκταρίου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετέθεσαν, τοιούτου τινὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν συμβάντος. Γυνή τις τῶν εὐγενῶν προσῆλθεν τῷ ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβυτέρῳ, καὶ κατὰ μέρος ἐξομολογεῖται τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἃς ἐπεπράχει μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα· ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος παρήγγειλε τῇ γυναικὶ, νηστεύειν καὶ συνεχῶς εὔχεσθαι, ἵνα σὺν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ καὶ ἔργον τι δεικνύειν ἔχῃ τῆς μετανοίας ἄξιον· ἡ δὲ γυνὴ προβαίνουσα καὶ ἄλλο πταῖσμα ἑαυτῆς κατηγόρει. ἔλεγε γὰρ, ὡς εἴη συγκαθευδήσας αὐτῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας διάκονος. Τοῦτο λεχθὲν τὸν μὲν διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκπεσεῖν παρεσκεύασε· ταραχὴ δὲ τέσσχε τὰ πλήθη· ἠγανάκτουν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τῷ γενομένῳ, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ βλασφημίαν ἡ πρᾶξις καὶ ὕβριν προυξένησεν. Διασυρομένων δὲ ἐκ τούτου τῶν ἱερωμένων ἀνδρῶν, Εὐδαίμων τὶς τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρεσβύτερος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τὸ γένος, γνώμην τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ δίδωσι Νεκταρίῳ, περιελεῖν μὲν τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβύτερον, συγχωρῆσαι δὲ ἕκαστον τῷ ἰδίῳ συνειδότι τῶν μυστηρίων μετέχειν· οὕτω γὰρ μόνον ἔχειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὸ ἀβλασφήμητον. Ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ Εὐδαίμονος ἀκούσας ἐγὼ, τῇ γραφῇ τῇδε παραδοῦναι ἐθάρρησα. . . Ἐγὼ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Εὐδαίμονα πρότερον ἔφην, Ἡ συμβουλή σου, ὦ πρεσβύτερε, εἰ συνήνεγκεν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἢ εἰ μὴ, Θεὸς ἂν εἰδείη· ὁρῶ δὲ ὅτι πρόφασιν παρέσχε τοῦ μὴ ἐλέγχειν ἀλλήλων τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, μὴ δὲ φυλάττειν τὸ τοῦ Ἀποστόλου παράγγελμα, τὸ λέγον, Μηδὲ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε.

tiary presbyters, τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας πρεσβυτέρους, out of the churches on this occasion. From the time that the Novatians made their separation from the Church, refusing to communicate with those that lapsed in the Decian persecution, the bishops added *to the ecclesiastical roll,* τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι, a penitential presbyter; that they who fell into any sins after baptism might make confession of them before the presbyter thereto appointed. And this order continues still among other sects; only they who receive the *consubstantial* doctrine, and the Novatians who agree with them in the same faith, are equally now agreed to reject the penitential presbyter. The Novatians, indeed, never admitted this additional office from the beginning; and the present governors of the Churches, though they allowed it for a long time, yet now under Nectarius laid it aside, upon a certain accident that happened in the Church. For a certain gentlewoman coming to the penitentiary presbyter, made particular confession of her sins that she had committed after baptism; and the presbyter enjoined her to fast and pray continually, that together with her confession she might show forth works worthy of repentance. But the woman, proceeding in the course of her penance, accused herself of another sin: for she confessed that one of the deacons of the Church had defiled her. Which occasioned the deacon to be cast out of the Church; and there was no small stir among the people, who were incensed, not barely for the fact, but because it brought great scandal and reproach upon the Church. And the clergy being chiefly reviled upon this occasion, one Eudæmon, a presbyter of the Church, born at Alexandria, gave counsel to Nectarius to take away the penitentiary presbyter, and leave it to every man's liberty to partake of the holy mysteries according to the direction of his own conscience: for this was the only way to free the Church from reproach.' 'This,' he says, 'he the more confidently inserted into his history, because he had it from the mouth of Eudæmon himself; though he told Eudæmon, he doubted whether his counsel was for the advantage of the Church, since it would occasion the neglect of mutual reproof, and the transgression of that rule of the Apostle, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."'

Sozomen[34], in relating the same story, observes, 'that the chief offices of this penitentiary presbyter were, partly to direct such as had need of public penance, how to go about it and perform it, and partly to impose private exercises of repentance upon those that needed not to undergo the public: and therefore that he was to be both a prudent man, to direct the one, and ἐχέμυθον, *a man that could keep secrets without disclosing them*, for the sake of the other.' He observes further, 'that when Nectarius had abolished this office at Constantinople, his example was followed by almost all the bishops of the East; but that it continued in use in the Western Churches, and chiefly at Rome, to prepare men for the public penance of the Church, which he there takes occasion to describe in the whole course and process of it.'

Now from hence it is obvious to observe, first, that this office was not set up to encourage auricular confession in prejudice to the public discipline, but chiefly to promote the exercise of public penance in the Church. Secondly, that it was not of divine, but only ecclesiastical institution. And therefore, thirdly, as it was instituted by the wisdom of the Church for good ends; so, when those ends could not be served and perhaps better might, it was at the Church's liberty, by the same wisdom, to abolish it and put it down again, as Nectarius did in the East. Fourthly, that the abolishing of it did not necessarily imply the abolishing of public discipline; which still continued in force in the Eastern Church, notwithstanding the abrogation of this office; though, perhaps, something weakened in respect to private offenders; partly because they were not so much inclined to confess; and partly because the business of discipline now devolving wholly upon the bishops, as it was before, they had not leisure to attend to it. Fifthly, it is very plain from hence that there was no necessity laid upon men to confess all their secret mortal sins before they came to the communion; but it was enough, as Valesius[35] ingenuously con-

[34] L. 7. c. 16. (ibid. p. 299. 30.) Πρεσβύτερον δὲ τῶν ἄριστα πολιτευομένων, ἐχέμυθόν τε καὶ ἔμφρονα, ἐπὶ τοῦτο τετάχασιν· ᾧ δὴ προσιόντες οἱ ἡμαρτηκότες, τὰ βεβιωμένα ὡμολόγουν· ὁ δὲ, πρὸς τὴν ἑκάστου ἁμαρτίαν, ὅ, τι χρὴ ποιῆσαι ἢ ἐκτίσαι ἐπιτίμιον θεὶς, ἀπέλυε, παρὰ σφῶν αὐτῶν τὴν δίκην εἰσπραξαμένους.

[35] In Sozom. l. 6. c. 28. (ibid. p.

fesses, 'for men to search their own consciences, whereby they thought they satisfied that precept of the Apostle, [1 Cor. 11, 28.] "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup."'

And so we have taken a full view of *confession*, both public and private, so far as it was in use and practice in the ancient Church, beyond which it is none of my province to extend the inquiry, and search after the deviations and corruptions of modern ages, which the reader may find in any of our polemical writers against the Church of Rome, or discern them by the account that has here been given, reducing every thing to the primitive standard.

CHAP. IV.

Of the great rigour, strictness, and severity of the discipline and penance of the ancient Church.

Public penance ordinarily allowed but once to any sort of sinners.

1. THERE remains now but one thing more to be considered in the exercise of the ancient public penance, and that is the great strictness, rigour, and severity of it, expressed against all sins that fell under public discipline, and more especially those that were of a more heinous and malignant nature. One instance of the severity of their penitential rules was, that they ordinarily admitted men but once to the privilege of public penance, and allowed no second penance to be performed in the Church by any sort of relapsers. I have already hinted this in the last chapter[36], and shall here give more evident proof of it, so far as concerns the general practice of the Church in the four first ages; showing withal what exceptions it admitted of, by the power that was lodged in every bishop's hands to moderate the exercise of discipline, as occasion might require, according to his own judgment and discretion. We do not indeed find any general rule or canon for this peremptory denial of a second penance to relapsers; but if we consider the practice of the Church, we shall find it almost universal.

257. n. 3.). . Notandus est hic locus; ex quo concludi videtur, eos, qui ad sacrorum mysteriorum participationem olim accedebant, absque prævia peccatorum confessione id facere solitos esse. Non quod non tutius esset, peccata sua prius confiteri sacerdoti; sed quia satisfacere se existimabant præcepto Apostoli dicentis, *Probet autem se ipsum homo, etc.*

[36] S. 3. p. 121.

Hermes Pastor, who wrote in the beginning of the second century, plainly asserts this[36], 'that the servants of God allowed but of once doing penance.' And therefore he advises the husband, who has an adulterous wife, 'to receive her once upon her repentance, but not oftener.' Clemens Alexandrinus[37] treads in the same steps, allowing but one repentance after baptism, and citing the authority of Hermes Pastor for it. Tertullian, whilst he was a Catholic, allowed with the Catholics one penance after baptism, which he calls *the second*, making the repentance of baptism to be the first, and this the last. 'God,' says he[37], 'has placed in the porch, (or entrance to the church,) a second repentance, which opens to those that knock; but now only once, because now a second time; never more, because the last was vain and to no purpose.' Then describing the whole course of this public penance, he says again[38], 'It is a second penance, and but one; which requires so much the more laborious exercise and trial, because it is a thing allowed us in our greatest exigency and distress.' In like manner Origen[39], speaking of the difference between greater and lesser sins, says 'the former had no place of repentance allowed them but only once, or very seldom; whereas those common sins we fall into almost every day, always admit of repentance, and are redeemed immediately without intermission.' There are several canons in the Council of Eliberis to the same purpose, that relapsers should not be admitted to communion by the benefit of a second repentance. One canon[40] says, 'that if any men commit

[36] L. 2. Mandat. 4. n. 1. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 89.) .... Debet recipere peccatricem, quæ pœnitentiam egit, sed non sæpe. Servis enim Dei pœnitentiam una est.

[37] Stromat. 2. c. 13. (p. 459. 3.) *Τὸν οὖν εἰληφότα τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, οὐκ ἔτι ἁμαρτάνειν χρή· ἐπὶ γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ καὶ μόνῃ μετανοίᾳ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, αὕτη ἂν εἴη τῶν προϋπαρξάντων κατὰ τὸν ἐθνικὸν καὶ πρῶτον βίον, τὸν ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ λέγω· αὐτίκα τοῖς κληθεῖσι πρόκειται μετάνοια, ἡ καθαίρουσα τὸν τόπον τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τῶν πλημμελημάτων, ἵνα ἡ πίστις θεμελιωθῇ.*

[37] De Pœnitent. c. 7. (p. 126 b.) Collocavit in vestibulo pœnitentiam secundam, quæ pulsantibus patefaciat: sed jam semel, quia jam secundo; sed amplius nunquam, quia [al. quam] proxime frustra.

[38] Ibid. c. 9. (p. ead. d.) Hujus igitur pœnitentiæ secundæ et unius, quanto in arto negotium est, tanto operosior probatio [est], &c.

[39] Hom. 15. in Levit. t. 1. p. 174. (t. 2. p. 262 c.) In gravioribus criminibus semel tantum, [vel raro] pœnitentiæ conceditur locus: ista vero communia, quæ frequenter incurrimus, semper pœnitentiam recipiunt, et sine intermissione redimuntur.

[40] C. 3. (t. 1. p. 971 a.) Si post pœnitentiam fuerint mœchati, pla-

adultery after they have done penance for idolatry, they shall no more be admitted to communion, that they may not seem to make a jest of the Lord's communion.' Another[41] orders, 'that if any of the faithful, who is under penance for adultery, commit fornication in the time of his penance, he shall not have the communion even at his last hour.' And a third canon[42] orders, 'that if a man who has been under penance for adultery, and is admitted to communion in sickness, or danger of imminent death, shall after his recovery commit adultery again, he shall no more make a jest of the communion of peace; that is, not have the privilege of a second penance, to obtain a second reconciliation or absolution.'

Neither was this only the discipline of the three first ages, but it continued to be the practice for an age or two after: for St. Ambrose and St. Austin speak of it as still in use in their time. 'They who think of doing penance often,' says St. Ambrose[43], 'are deservedly reproved, because they grow wanton against Christ: for if they did penance truly, they would not think it was to be repeated; because as there is but one baptism, so there is but one penance, that is performed in public. There is indeed a daily repentance for sin, but that is for lesser sins, and the other for greater.' In like manner St. Austin[44] says, 'It was wisely and usefully ordered, that there should be no room for that public and humblest sort of penance in the Church; lest it should make the remedy of sin contemptible, and so less useful to the sinner.' This was the practice of the Roman Church also in the time of Siricius, and of Innocent and Leo, who commonly follow his prescriptions. The Decree of

cuit ulterius non eis dandam esse communionem, ne lusisse [al. illusisse] de Dominica communione videantur.

[41] C. 7. (ibid. c.) Si quis forte fidelis post lapsum mœchiæ, post tempora constituta, accepta pœnitentia, denuo fuerit fornicatus, placuit nec in fine habere eum communionem.

[42] C. 47. (ibid. p. 975 e.) Si resuscitatus rursus fuerit mœchatus, placuit eum ulterius non ludere de communione pacis.

[43] De Pœnitent. l. 2. c. 10. (t. 2. p. 436 d. n. 95.) Merito reprehenduntur, qui sæpius agendam pœnitentiam putant quia luxuriantur in Christo. Nam si vere agerent pœnitentiam, iterandam esse [al. postea] non putarent: quia sicut unum baptisma ita una pœnitentia, quæ tamen publice agitur. Nam quotidiani nos debet pœnitere peccati; sed hæc delictorum leviorum, illa graviorum.

[44] Ep. 54. [al. 153.] ad Macedon. (t. 2. p. 526 f.) ... Caute salubriterque provisum, ut locus illius humillimæ pœnitentiæ semel in ecclesia concedatur, ne medicina vilis minus utilis esset ægrotis, &c.—See before, ch. 3. s. 3. p. 123. n. 80.

Siricius[45] about this matter runs in these terms: 'Forasmuch as that they, who after penance return like dogs to their vomit, or swine to their wallowing in the mire, cannot have the benefit of a second penance, we decree, that they shall communicate with the faithful in prayer only, and be present at the celebration of the eucharist, but not partake of the Lord's feast at his table; that by this punishment they may learn to chastise their errors privately in themselves, and also set others an example how to abstain from the lusts of uncleanness. Yet, forasmuch as they fall by the frailty of the flesh, we would have them to be allowed their *viaticum* at the last, and be assisted with the grace of communion, when they are going to the Lord.'

It appears also from the canons of several Councils in the same age, that such relapsers were either wholly cast out of the Church, or at least kept back from the communion all their days, without being admitted to the benefit of any formal penance to restore them: as may be seen in the second Council of Arles[46], the Council of Vannes[47], the first of Tours[48], and the first of Orleans[49]; but more especially in the third of Toledo,

[45] Ep. 1. ad Himer. c. 5. (CC. t. 2. p. 1019 a.) De his, ... qui, acta pœnitentia, tanquam canes ac sues ad vomitus pristinos et ad volutabra redeuntes, ... quia jam suffugium non habent pœnitendi, id duximus [al. diximus] decernendum, ut sola intra ecclesiam fidelibus oratione jungantur; sacris mysteriorum celebritatibus, quamvis non mereantur, intersint: a Dominicæ autem mensæ convivio segregentur, ut, hac saltem districtione correpti, et ipsi in se sua errata castigent, et aliis exemplum tribuant, quatenus ab obscœnis cupiditatibus retrahantur. Quibus [al. quas] tamen, quia carnali fragilitate ceciderunt, viatico munere, cum ad Dominum cœperint proficisci, per communionis gratiam volumus subveniri [al. sublevari].

[46] C. 21. (t. 4. p. 1013 d.) Pœnitens quæcunque defuncto viro alii nubere præsumpserit, vel suspecta vel interdicta familiaritate cum extraneo vixerit, cum eodem ab ecclesiæ liminibus arceatur. Hoc etiam de viro in pœnitentia posito placuit observari.

[47] C. 3. (ibid. p. 1055 c.) Pœnitentes quoque, qui susceptam publice pœnitentiam intermiserint, et, ad prioris erroris consuetudinem revoluti, vitæ se sæculari conversationique reddiderint, non solum a communione Dominicorum sacramentorum, sed etiam a conviviis fidelium submovendos.

[48] C. 8. (ibid. p. 1052 a.) Si quis vero post acceptam pœnitentiam, sicut canis ad vomitum suum, ita ad sæculares illecebras, derelicta quam professus est pœnitentia, fuerit reversus, a communione ecclesiæ vel a convivio fidelium extraneus habeatur, quo facilius et ipse compunctionem per hanc confusionem accipiat, et alii ejus terreantur exemplo.

[49] C. 13. (ibid. p. 1406 e.) De his, qui, suscepta pœnitentia, religionem sacræ professionis obliti ad sæcularia relabuntur; placuit eos et a com-

where notice is taken of the contrary custom beginning to creep into some of the Spanish Churches, and a strict order is made to correct it by reviving the ancient discipline of the Church. 'We hear,' say they[50], 'that in some of the Spanish Churches penance is not done according to canon, but after a very base fashion; that as often as men are pleased to sin, so often they require of the presbyters to be reconciled or absolved: to restrain which execrable presumption, the holy synod appoints, that penance shall be granted only according to the form of the ancient canons: and if any, either during the time of their penance, or after their reconciliation, relapse into their old vices, they shall be condemned according to the severity of former canons.' That is, they shall not have liberty of repeating public penance *toties quoties* in the church. They did not deny men private penance, either for lesser sins of daily incursion, or for relapses into greater sins; but exhorted men to repent in both cases, in hopes of obtaining mercy and pardon from God by a sincere contrition and the diligent exercise of a private repentance. No confession was taken by the priest in either of these cases: for the first did not need it, and the second was not allowed it; only at their last hour relapsers were admitted to the communion and peace of the Church, if they had exercised themselves diligently in all the proper acts of private repentance.

Some sinners held under a strict penance all their lives to the very hour of death.

2. And this leads us to consider another instance of the great strictness and severity of the ancient discipline, which was, that for some certain sins men were kept under the exercise of public penance all their lives, and only absolved and reconciled at the point of death. The ordinary course of penance often held men for ten, fifteen, or twenty years in going through

munione suspendi, et ab omnium Catholicorum convivio separari.—Conf. C. Ilerdens. c. 5. (ibid. p. 1612 b.) Quod si iterato, velut canes ad vomitum, reversi fuerint, non solum dignitate officii careant, sed etiam sanctam communionem, nisi in exitu, non percipiant.

[50] C. Tolet. 3. c. 11. (t. 5. p. 1011 d.) Quoniam comperimus per quasdam Hispaniarum ecclesias, non secundum canonem, sed fœdissime pro suis peccatis homines agere pœnitentiam, ut quoties peccare libuerit, toties a presbyteris se reconciliari expostulant: et ideo pro coercenda tam exsecrabili præsumptione id a sancto concilio jubetur, ut secundum formam canonum antiquorum detur pœnitentia..... Hi vero, qui ad propria [al. priora] vitia, vel infra pœnitentiæ tempus, vel post reconciliationem, relabuntur, secundum priorum canonum severitatem damnentur.

the several stages of repentance; but for some more heinous and enormous crimes no certain term of years was limited but their lives; and perfect reconciliation and absolution was only granted them at their last hour, when imminent danger of death was upon them. Thus the Council of Eliberis[51] orders, 'that if any one took upon him the office of a *flamen*, (or *Gentile priest*,) though he did not offer sacrifice, but only exhibit the usual games or shows to the people, he should do a severe and canonical penance all his life, and only be admitted to communion at the point of death.' The like order[52] is given about consecrated virgins, 'that if any of them committed fornication, they should do penance all the time of their lives, and only have the communion at the hour of death.' The Council of Neocæsarea[53] appoints the same for a woman who marries two brothers, 'that she shall be cast out of communion unto death; but at her last hour, to show clemency toward her, if she promise upon her recovery to dissolve the marriage, she shall have the benefit of repentance.' The first Council of Arles[54] inflicts the same punishment upon those that falsely accuse their brethren, 'that they shall not communicate to the hour of death.' The Council of Ancyra[55] decrees the like for such married men as are guilty of bestiality after they are fifty years old, 'that they shall not be received into communion till the end of their lives.' The Council of Valence[56], in France,

[51] C. 3. (t. 1. p. 971 a.) Item flamines, qui non immolaverint, sed munus tantum dederint, eo quod se a funestis abstinuerunt sacrificiis, placuit eis in fine præstari communionem, acta tamen legitima pœnitentia.

[52] C. 13. (ibid. p. 972 b.) Si omni tempore vitæ suæ hujusmodi fœminæ egerint pœnitentiam, placuit eas in fine accipere debere communionem.

[53] C. 2. (ibid. p. 1841 a.) Γυνὴ, ἐὰν γήμηται δύο ἀδελφοῖς, ἐξωθείσθω μεχρὶ θανάτου, πλὴν ἐν θανάτῳ διὰ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν, εἰποῦσα ὡς ὑγιάνασα λύσει τὸν γάμον, ἕξει τὴν μετάνοιαν.

[54] C. 14. (ibid. p. 1428 e.) De his, qui falso accusant fratres suos, placuit eos usque ad exitum non communicare.

[55] C. 16. (ibid. p. 1461 d.) Εἰ δέ τινες καὶ γυναῖκας ἔχοντες, καὶ ὑπερβάντες τὸν πεντηκονταετῆ χρόνον, ἥμαρτον, ἐπὶ τῇ ἐξόδῳ τοῦ βίου τυγχανέτωσαν τῆς κοινωνίας.

[56] An. 374. c. 3. (t. 2. p. 905 c.) Circa eorum vero personas, qui se post unum et sanctum lavacrum, vel profanis sacrificiis dæmonum, vel incesta lavatione polluerint, eam censuræ formam duximus esse servandam, ut his juxta Synodum Nicænam satisfactionis quidem aditus non negetur, ne infelicibus lacrymis vel solatii janua desperatione claudatur: acturi vero pœnitentiam usque in diem mortis, non sine spe tamen remissionis, quam ab eo plene sperare debebunt, qui ejus largitatem et solus obtinet, et tam dives mise-

laid the same penalty upon some that fell into idolatry, 'that they should do penance to the hour of death, yet not without hopes of remission, which they were to expect more fully from God, who was the donor of it.' The Council of Lerida[57] allows the inferior clergy to do penance for a first offence, and regain their office upon it: but, 'if they return like dogs to their vomit, and as swine to their wallowing in the mire, they are not only to be deprived of their office, but of the communion to their last hour.' And so Felix III[58], bishop of Rome, determined in the case of those African bishops, presbyters, and deacons, who suffered themselves to be rebaptized by the Arians in the Vandalic persecution: 'that they continue under penance to the day of their death; and neither be present at the prayers of the faithful, nor the catechumens, and only be admitted to lay-communion at the point of death.'

Such as were absolved upon a death-bed, were obliged to perform their ordinary penance, if they recovered.

3. Another instance of the strictness and severity of the ancient discipline is visible in the treatment of such penitents as were reconciled upon a death-bed. Though they were admitted to the peace and communion of the Church, when they were in extreme necessity, and imminent danger of death, that they might have their *viaticum* when they were about to leave the world: yet, if they chanced to recover, they were obliged to perform the whole penance, more or less, whatever it was, which they should have done, had not such an exigency procured them an absolution. And this is the only case in which the ancient Church ever allowed any absolution to be granted before the penance was duly and regularly performed. Which being an extraordinary case, it is nothing to those who think to justify the same practice now in ordinary cases: but of this more hereafter[59].

As to the present observation, that penitents absolved upon a death-bed were, upon their recovery, reduced to the same state of penance which they were to have been under, had not the necessity of sickness required their absolution, it is evident

ricordia est, ut nemo desperet. Deus enim mortem non fecit, nec lætatur in perditione vivorum.

[57] C. 5. See the second part of n. 49, preceding.

[58] Vid. C. Roman. c. 2. (CC. [Ep. 3. al. 7.] t. 4. p. 1076 c.)... Usque ad exitus sui diem in pœnitentia jacere conveniet; nec orationi non modo fidelium, sed nec catechumenorumo mnimodis interesse; quibus communio laica tantum in morte reddenda est.

[59] See b. 19. ch. 2. s. 1. p. 188.

from the plain testimony of several Councils. The Council of Nice[59] orders such upon their recovery 'to be placed among those that communicated in prayers only,' that is, in the fourth rank of penitents, called *co-standers*, 'where they might stay to hear the prayers of the faithful, but not partake of the oblation.' The fourth Council of Carthage has two canons relating to them. The first[60] says, if such a penitent recover, 'he shall be subjected to the ordinary laws of penance as long as the priest, who admitted him to penance, shall judge convenient.' The other[61], 'that penitents, who in time of sickness receive the *viaticum* of the eucharist, shall not think themselves absolved, unless they undergo imposition of hands, if they chance to recover;' that is, the imposition of hands which was given to penitents of the third order, called *prostrators*, who were obliged to present themselves every day at church, and kneel down before the bishop to receive the solemn imposition of hands with the usual penitential prayers and benediction, [as has been mentioned in the fifth section of the first chapter of this Book].

The first Council of Orange[62] more particularly explains the whole matter in this form: 'They who are about to leave the body, when they are doing penance, may communicate without the reconciliatory imposition of hands, which sort of communion is sufficient for the consolation of a dying person, according to the decrees of the Fathers, who call this kind of communion their *viaticum*. But if they survive, they shall stand in the order

[59] C. 13. (t. 2. p. 36 b.) .... Εἰ δὲ ἀπογνωσθεὶς, καὶ κοινωνίας πάλιν τυχὼν, πάλιν ἐν τοῖς ζῶσιν ἐξετασθῇ, μετὰ τῶν κοινωνούντων τῆς εὐχῆς μόνης ἔστω.

[60] C. Carth. 4. c. 76. (ibid. p. 1205 e.) Is, qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit, oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit, vel in phrenesin versus fuerit, dent testimonium, qui eum audierunt, et accipiat pœnitentiam. Et si continuo creditur moriturus, reconcilietur per manus impositionem, et infundatur ori ejus eucharistia. Si supervixerit, admoneatur a supra dictis testibus, petitioni suæ satisfactum; et subdatur statutis pœnitentiæ legibus, quamdiu sacerdos, qui pœnitentiam dederit, probaverit.

[61] C. 78. (ibid. p. 1206 b.) Pœnitentes, qui in infirmitate viaticum eucharistiæ acceperint, non se credant absolutos sine manus impositione, si supervixerint.

[62] C. 3. (t. 3. p. 1448 d.) Qui recedunt se corpore, pœnitentia accepta, placuit, sine reconciliatoria manus impositione eos communicare, quod morientis sufficit consolationi secundum definitiones Patrum, qui hujusmodi communionem congruenter viaticum nominaverunt. Quod si supervixerint, stent in ordine pœnitentium, ut ostensis necessariis pœnitentiæ fructibus, legitimam communionem cum reconciliatoria manus impositione recipiant [al. percipiant].

of penitents, that they may first show forth the necessary fruits of repentance, and then be received to communion in the ordinary and regular way, by the reconciliatory imposition of hands.' The Council of Epone[63] speaks much after the same manner: 'That no one should be repelled from or by the Church without remedy, or hopes of pardon, nor the door of returning to pardon be shut against one that repents and corrects his errors: and if any one be in imminent danger of death, the time prescribed for his condemnation or penance shall be relaxed. But if it happens that the sick man recovers after he has received his *viaticum*, he must observe and fulfil the time of penance that was appointed him.' Gregory Nyssen's canon[64] is much to the same purpose: 'If any one be in imminent danger of death, who has not gone through the whole time appointed for his penance; the clemency of the Fathers in that case has decreed, that he shall not take his long journey [out of the world] without his *viaticum* or provision for it, nor without partaking of the holy mysteries. But if after participation he recover from his sickness, he must then continue the time appointed in that order or station of penitents, in which he was when this necessity and danger came upon him.' To all these may be added the decree of the Roman Council[65] under Felix III, anno 487, which renews the determination of the Nicene fathers: 'That if any of those, who had been admitted to communion before the fixed time of their penance was completed, because their life was despaired of by the physicians, and evident signs of death were upon them,

[63] C. 36. (t. 4. p. 1580 e.) Ne ullus sine remedio aut spe veniæ ab ecclesia repellatur; neve ulli, si aut pœnituerit, aut se correxerit, ad veniam redeundi aditus obstruatur: et si cuiquam forsitan discrimen mortis immineat, damnationis constitutæ tempora relaxentur. Quod si ægrotum, accepto viatico, revalescere fortasse contingit, statuti temporis spatia observare conveniet.

[64] Ep. ad Letoium, c. 5. t. 2. p. 120 d. (CC. [c. 4.] t. 2. p. 1788 b.) *Εἰ δέ τις μὴ πληρώσας τὸν χρόνον, τὸν ἐκ τῶν κανόνων ἀφωρισμένον, ἐξοδεύοι τοῦ βίου· κελεύει ἡ τῶν Πατέρων φιλανθρωπία, μετασχόντα τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, μὴ κενὸν τοῦ ἐφοδίου, πρὸς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἐκείνην καὶ μακρὰν ἀποδημίαν ἐκπεμφθῆναι· εἰ δὲ μετασχὼν τοῦ ἁγιάσματος πάλιν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν ἐπανέλθοι, ἀναμένειν τὸν τεταγμένον χρόνον, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ βαθμῷ γενόμενον, ἐν ᾧ ἦν πρὸ τῆς κατὰ ἀνάγκην αὐτῷ δοθείσης κοινωνίας.*

[65] C. Roman. c. 4. (CC. [Fel. Ep. 3. al. 7.] t. 4. p. 1076 e.) Quod si ante præfinitum pœnitentiæ tempus desperatus a medicis, aut evidentibus mortis pressus indiciis, recepta quisquam communionis gratia convalescat; servemus in eo quod Nicæni canones ordinaverunt, ut habeatur inter eos, qui in oratione sola communicant, donec impleatur spatium temporis eidem præstitutum.

should happen afterwards to recover, they should at least continue in the fourth rank of penitents, among those that communicated only in prayers without the oblation, till the full term of their penance was ended.'

Some sinners denied communion at their last hour.

4. But some sinners were yet more severely handled: for they were denied communion to the very last, and suffered to go out of the world without any manner of reconciliation. This discipline was generally used at first toward the three great sins of idolatry, adultery, and murder, which, as learned men[66] agree, continued almost to the time of Cyprian. Cyprian himself[67] assures us, 'that many of his predecessors absolutely refused to admit adulterers to communion at their very last hour.' And though this rigour was abated by general agreement toward penitents in his time, yet they still continued to deny communion to the very last to such apostates, as persisted obstinate and impenitent all their lives, and only desired reconciliation when the pangs of death were upon them. 'They,' says he[68],' 'who do no penance, nor ever testify any sorrow for their sin from their heart by manifest professions of lamentation, though they begin to deprecate and sue for pardon when infirmity and the danger of death is upon them, such we think fit to debar absolutely from all hopes of communion and peace: because it is not repentance for their sins, but only the apprehension and terror of approaching death that compels them to ask pardon: and he is not worthy to receive consolation at his death, who would not beforehand consider that he must

[66] Vid. Albaspin. Observat. l. 2. cc. 7–20. (ad calc. Optat. pp. 64, seqq.) Quis auderet, &c. — Bona, Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 17. n. 1. (p. 212.) In exordio Christianæ religionis tantum erat pietatis studium, tantum odium improbitatis, ut quibusdam sceleribus, quæ atrociora visa sunt, omnis prorsus veniæ spes, omnis pœnitentia denegaretur; adeo ut qui ea commisisset, quamvis a divina misericordia eorum remissionem veræ contritionis subsidio obtineret, nunquam tamen posset cum ecclesia reconciliari. Et [leg. Ea] erant idololatria, homicidium, et adulterium, &c.—Fell. Not. in Cypr. Ep. 8. p. 17. (p. 181. n. 3.) Porro voces illæ, *Ab eo, qui potest præstare,* subnectuntur; quia nondum ecclesia idololatras decreto aliquo ad pœnitentiam admisit, licet statim id fecerit.

[67] Cypr. Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 110. See afterward, s. 5. first part of n. 94, following.

[68] Ibid. p. 111. (p. 248.) Pœnitentiam non agentes, nec dolorem delictorum suorum toto corde et manifesta lamentationis suæ professione testantes, prohibendos omnino censuimus a spe communicationis et pacis, si in infirmitate et periculo cœperint deprecari: quia rogare illos non delicti pœnitentia, sed mortis urgentis admonitio compellit: nec dignus est in morte accipere solatium, qui se non cogitavit esse moriturum.

shortly die.' We find this rule concerning apostates some time after renewed by the first Council of Arles, where a decree [69] was passed, 'that such apostates as never presented themselves to the Church, nor sought to do any manner of penance, but at last, when they were seized with an infirmity, desired to have the communion, should in that case be debarred from it, unless they recovered, and brought forth fruits worthy of repentance.' And Innocent [70], bishop of Rome, plainly says this was the primitive custom for the three first ages of persecution: 'If any one after baptism spent his whole life in intemperance and pleasure, and in the end of his days desired penance and the reconciliation of communion, they only admitted him to penance, but absolutely denied him communion. For in those days persecutions being very frequent, lest the easiness of obtaining communion should make men secure of reconciliation, and retard their returning from sin, communion was justly denied them, and only penance allowed them, that they might not be deprived of the whole. The consideration of the times made their remission or reconciliation more difficult to be obtained: but after the Lord had granted peace to his Church, and the terror of persecution was over, then it seemed good to the Church to receive all such to communion when they were going out of the world, and for the mercy of the Lord to grant it to them as their *viaticum*, (or *provision for their journey*,) lest we should seem to follow the asperity and

[69] C. 2. (t. 1. p. 1429 c.) De his, qui apostatant, et nunquam se ad ecclesiam repræsentant, nec quidem pœnitentiam agere quærunt, et postea in infirmitate arrepti petunt communionem, placuit, eis non dandam communionem, nisi revaluerint et egerint dignos fructus pœnitentiæ.

[70] Ep. 3. ad Exuperium, c. 2. (CC. t. 2. p. 1255 c.) Et hoc quæsitum est, quid de his observari debeat, qui, post baptismum omni tempore intemperantiæ et voluptatibus dediti, in extremo fine vitæ suæ pœnitentiam simul et reconciliationem communionis exposcunt. De his observatio prior, durior: posterior, interveniente misericordia, inclinatior est. Nam consuetudo prior tenuit, ut concederetur eis pœnitentia, sed communio negaretur. Nam cum illis temporibus crebræ persecutiones essent, ne communionis concessa facilitas homines de reconciliatione securos non revocaret a lapsu, negata merito communio est, concessa pœnitentia, ne totum penitus negaretur: et duriorem remissionem fecit temporis ratio. Sed posteaquam Dominus noster pacem ecclesiis suis reddidit, jam terrore depulso communionem dari abeuntibus placuit, et propter Domini misericordiam quasi viaticum profecturis, et ne Novatiani hæretici, negantis veniam, asperitatem et duritiem sequi videamur.

hardness of Novatian the heretic, who denied men pardon for greater sins committed after baptism.'

The canons of the Council of Eliberis do abundantly confirm this observation made by Pope Innocent upon the preceding ages of persecution. For there are at least twenty canons in that Council, which deny communion to the very last to several sorts of sinners, whose crimes were either doubled and tripled, or single crimes of a more flagrant scandal and heinous provocation. Thus the first canon[71] determines in the case of voluntary idolaters and apostates, who without any compulsion went of their own accord to the temple, and offered sacrifice: this being a more heinous and capital offence than bare sacrificing by the violence and force of torture, it is ordered, 'that such apostates shall not have the communion even at their last hour.' The next canon[72] inflicts the same punishment upon such idolaters as are guilty of a complication of crimes. As when a Christian takes upon him the office of a *flamen*, or *Heathen high-priest*, and therein adds to his idolatry either adultery or murder. So if a man kills another by sorcery[73], 'because there is idolatry joined with murder, he is not to have the communion even at the hour of death.' If a man whilst he is doing penance for idolatry or adultery, relapses[74] into the same, or any other great crime, this repetition of his crime in such a case debars him from communion at his last hour. Another canon[75] orders the like severity to be used towards women, who without cause forsake their own husbands and are married to other men; and the same is determined[76] in case a

[71] C. 1. (t. 1. p. 969 e.) Placuit, ut quicunque [al. inter eos, qui] post fidem baptismi salutaris, adulta ætate, ad templum idololatraturus accesserit, et fecerit, quod est crimen capitale [al. principale], nec in fine eum communionem accipere.

[72] C. 2. (ibid. e.) Flamines, qui post fidem lavacri et regenerationis sacrificaverunt, eo quod geminaverint scelera, accedente homicidio, vel triplicaverint facinus cohærente mœchia, placuit, eos nec in fine accipere communionem.

[73] Ibid. c. 6. (ibid. p. 971 c.) Si quis vero maleficio interficiat alterum, eo quod sine idololatria perficere scelus non potuit, nec in fine impertiendam esse illi communionem.

[74] Cc. 3 et 7. See before, s. 1. nn. 40 and 46, preceding.

[75] C. 8. (ibid. p. 971 d.) Fœminæ, quæ, nulla præcedente causa, reliquerint viros suos, et se copulaverint alteris, nec in fine accipiant communionem.

[76] C. 10. (ibid. e.) Si fuerit fidelis, quæ ducitur ab eo, qui uxorem inculpatam reliquit, et cum scierit illum habere uxorem, quam sine causa reliquit; placuit, huic nec in fine dandam esse communionem.

woman is married to a man, whom she knows to have unlawfully divorced himself from a former wife: both these sorts are denied communion to the very last. Another canon[77] subjects all panders and promoters of uncleanness to the same penalty, whether it be a father or mother, or any other Christian that exercises this abominable trade: 'because they sell the bodies of others, or rather their own, they are not to have communion even at their last hour.' The same is determined [78] in the case of a virgin dedicated to God: if she commits fornication, and continues in her uncleanness without reflecting upon what she has done, there is no absolution for her in her last minutes. As neither for the man[79] that marries his daughter to any idol-priest. Not for any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, that commits adultery[80], whilst he is actually in the ministry, both because of the scandal, and also the wickedness and profaneness of the crime itself. So if a woman commits adultery in her husband's absence, and murders her infant[81], she is not to have communion at the very last, because she doubles her crime. In like manner[82] a woman is to be treated that lives in adultery all her life with another man. And also any clergyman[83] that knows his wife to be guilty of adultery, and does not immediately put her away; lest they, who ought to be examples of good conversation to others, should seem to teach others the way to sin. The same punishment is awarded[84] to

[77] C. 12. (ibid. p. 972 a.) Mater, vel parens, vel quælibet fidelis, si lenocinium exercuerit, eo quod alienum vendiderit corpus, vel potius suum; placuit, eas nec in fine accipere communionem.

[78] C. 13. (ibid. b.) Virgines, quæ se Deo dicaverint, si pactum perdiderint virginitatis, atque eidem libidini servierint, non intelligentes quod amiserint; placuit, nec in fine eis dandam esse communionem.

[79] C. 17. (ibid. e.) Si qui forte sacerdotibus idolorum filias suas junxerint; placuit, nec in fine eis dandam esse communionem.

[80] C. 18. (ibid. e.) Episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, si in ministerio positi, detecti fuerint quod sint mœchati; placuit, et propter scandalum, et propter profanum crimen, nec in fine eos communionem accipere debere.

[81] C. 63. (ibid. 977 b.) Si qua mulier per adulterium, absente marito, conceperit, idque post facinus occiderit; placuit, neque in fine dandam esse communionem: eo quod geminaverit scelus.

[82] C. 64. (ibid. c.) Si qua mulier usque in finem mortis suæ cum alieno viro fuerit mœchata; placuit, nec in fine dandam ei esse communionem.

[83] C. 65. (ibid. d.) Si cujus clerici uxor fuerit mœchata, et scierit eam maritus suus mœchari, et non eam statim projecerit, nec in fine accipiat communionem: ne ab his, qui exemplum bonæ conversationis esse debent, ab eis videantur scelerum magisteria procedere.

[84] C. 66. (ibid. d.) Si quis privignam suam duxerit uxorem, eo

any one that commits incest by marrying his wife's daughte by a former husband: and to such as are conscious and con senting[85] to their wife's adultery. And to all that commi sodomy with boys[86]; and to women who commit adultery witl any man, and afterwards marry[87] another husband and no the man who defiled them. If any one turn informer agains his brethren, so that they suffer[88] banishment, confiscation, o death by his information, he is not to have communion at hi last hour. If any one accuse a bishop, presbyter, or deacon o false crimes[89], and do not make out what he alleges agains them, he is to be denied communion to the very last.

I have represented these things at large, both to evidenc the thing now asserted, and also to show what sort of heinou crimes those were, for which this great severity of disciplin was used toward men at their last hour. Some learned person are offended at this Council for its extreme severity an rigour. Auxilius[90] heretofore brought the charge of Novatian ism against Hosius and the Council together; and Suicerus[9 asserts, that the orthodox Church always taught that lapser were to be received into communion upon their repentance which in effect is to bring the charge of Novatianism agains this Council, and to make it no part of the orthodox Church But then the difficulty will be, how to clear Cyprian and th Council of Arles from the same charge of Novatianism. For i is plain they were in the same sentiments as to what concerne apostates, who neglected penance to the hour of death: an not only they, but the great Council of Sardica, which restore Athanasius, will be involved in the same condemnation. Fo

quod sit incestus; placuit, nec in fine dandam esse ei communionem.

[85] C. 70. (ibid. p. 978 a.) Si cum conscientia mariti uxor fuerit mœchata; placuit, nec in fine dandam esse communionem.

[86] C. 71. (ibid. a.) Stupratoribus puerorum nec in fine dandam esse communionem.

[87] C. 72. (ibid. d.) Si qua vidua fuerit mœchata, . . . si alium duxerit, relicto illo, nec in fine dandam esse communionem.

[88] C. 73. (ibid. b.) Delator si quis exstiterit fidelis, et per delationem ejus aliquis fuerit præscriptus, vel interfectus; placuit eum nec i fine accipere communionem.

[89] C. 75. (ibid. d.) Si quis auten episcopum, vel presbyterum, au diaconum falsis criminibus appeti erit, et probare non potuerit, nec i fine dandam ei communionem.

[90] De Ordinat. Formosi, l. 1. cc 12 et 14.—Item, l. 2. c. 23. (ad calc Morin. de Ordinat. pp. 300, seqq.)

[91] Thes. Eccles. voce, Μετάνοια (t. 2. p. 357.) Lapsos autem, si qui dem pœnitentiam egerint, recipien dos esse, constanter docuit ecclesi orthodoxa.

there is a canon in that Council, which is as peremptory in this manner as any in the Council of Eliberis. The canon [92] orders, 'that if any bishop out of ambition or covetousness procure himself to be removed from a lesser city to a greater, without the approbation of a synod, he shall not be admitted even to lay-communion at his last hour.' So that, if this were Novatianism, there is no apology to be made for this Council, no more than for that of Eliberis; the decrees of both Councils being the very same, and of equal severity toward extraordinary offenders. The Novatians indeed sometimes laid hold of this practice in the Church, as an handle to justify their own unwarrantable proceedings against all great sins committed after baptism: they said they only treated the laity as the Catholics did the clergy, whom for several crimes they debarred from all communion to the very last. For so Socrates [93] tells us, Asclepiades the Novatian bishop argued with Atticus bishop of Constantinople. When Atticus acknowledged that communion might reasonably be denied even at the point of death to such as sacrificed to idols, and that he himself had sometimes done so; Asclepiades replied, 'There are many other sins unto death, as the Scripture calls them, besides sacrificing to idols, for which ye shut the clergy out of the Church, and we the laity, remitting them over to God alone for their pardon.

How this may be vindicated and cleared from the charges of Novatianism.

5. But this was only a sophistical argument and false apology for the Novatian schism; which, though it has imposed upon many learned men, and driven them to strange difficulties in explaining many of the ancient canons, and obliged them to put a forced and unnatural sense upon plain words, for fear they should seem to encourage the same error as Novatian held: yet the fallacy will easily be discerned by a right stating the matter, and setting things in a proper light before the reader.

The question between the Church and the Novatians was not, whether communion at the hour of death might be denied to some sort of sinners: for in this they both agreed, and the

[92] C. 2. (t. 2. p. 628 e.)...Μηδὲ ἐν τῷ τέλει λαϊκῆς γοῦν ἀξιοῦσθαι κοινωνίας.

[93] L. 7. c. 25. (v. 2. p. 374. 40.) Ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης, Ἕκτος, ἔφη, τοῦ ἐπιθῦσαι, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ κατὰ τὰς Γραφὰς εἰσὶν ἁμαρτίαι πρὸς θάνατον, δι' ἃς ὑμεῖς μὲν πρὸς τοὺς κληρικοὺς, ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ τοὺς λαϊκοὺς ἀποκλείομεν, Θεῷ μόνῳ τὴν συγχώρησιν αὐτῶν ἐπιτρέποντες.

practice of the Church in many cases was no less severe toward some great and flagrant crimes, or a complication of crimes, than was that of the Novatians, as evidently appears from what has been already discoursed. But the question was about *the ministerial power of absolution*, or *admitting penitent sinners to the peace and communion of the Church again, after they had lapsed or fallen into any great sin after baptism.* The Novatians stiffly maintained that the Church had no such ministerial power of the keys committed to her; but that all such sinners were for ever to be excluded and kept out of her communion; and that if she admitted any of them again, her communion was polluted and profaned by their contagion: and upon this principle they made a separation from the Church, as infected by the communion of sinners. The Church on the other hand asserted her own just right and power, that by the commission of the keys from Christ, she had the power to loose as well as bind; to receive penitents into the Church upon their reformation, as well as cast out flagitious men for their notorious transgressions: and though in some extraordinary cases, either where the crimes were very heinous and numerous, or where for want of time she could not have sufficient evidence of men's repentance, when they continued in their apostasy and impenitency till they were threatened by death, she sometimes suffered such men to go out of the world without reconciliation and communion; yet she did not this for want of power to receive sinners into her communion, but because she judged it more proper to let her censures continue upon such to the very last, to be an example and terror to others. So that, though the practice of the Church and the Novatians was in some cases the same, yet their principles were very different, and vastly wide of one another. The Novatians wholly denied this power to the Church, and made a schism upon it; the Church maintained her own just power, and used it with discretion, sometimes one way, and sometimes another, as she judged most expedient in her own wisdom for the benefit and edification of sinners, without dividing communion upon this point among the governors of the Church, whatever way they thought fit to practise. This is what Cyprian [94] observes

[94] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 110. (p. 247.) Et quidem apud antecessores nostros quidam de episcopis istic in provincia nostra dan-

chiefly against Novatian, in the case of admitting and not admitting adulterers to communion. 'Some of our predecessors,' says he, 'in this province were of opinion that peace was not to be granted to adulterers, and therefore they wholly shut the door of repentance against adultery; yet they did not depart from the college of their fellow-bishops upon this account, or break the unity of the Catholic Church by any obstinate stiffness in their censure; so as that because peace was granted by others to adulterers, therefore they who would not grant it, should make a separation from the Church. But the bond of concord remaining entire, and the mystical unity of the Catholic Church continuing undivided, every bishop managed and directed his own acts of discipline as he thought proper, being to give an account of his resolutions and management to the Lord.'

It appears from hence, that the dispute between the Church and Novatians was not barely about practice, but about principles and the power of the Church, in the use and management of the keys of discipline: and therefore though the Church sometime did the same thing that the Novatians did in refusing communion to some sinners even at the point of death, yet she was no ways chargeable with Novatianism, because she acted upon different views and principles, and only made use of her just power in a discretionary way, to extend or contract her censures, as she judged most expedient for the benefit and edification of the whole community, or any particular member of it. And thus, I find, many learned men, such as Albaspinæus [95], Bishop Beveridge [96], and Cardinal Bona [97], have

dam pacem mœchis non putaverunt, et in totum pœnitentiæ locum contra adulteria clauserunt: non tamen a coepiscoporum suorum collegio recesserunt, aut Catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem vel duritiæ vel censuræ suæ obstinatione ruperunt, ut, quia apud alios adulteris pax dabatur, qui non dabat, de ecclesia separaretur. Manente concordiæ vinculo et perseverante Catholicæ ecclesiæ individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus.

[95] Observat. l. 2. c. 21. (ad calc. Optat. p. 77 d.) Per magni interest, &c.

[96] Not. ad C. Nicæn. c. 8. (t. 2. append. p. 66. corrige, 68.) Neque enim Novatiani ea, quæ iis vulgo ascribitur, opinione fuerunt, ut istis, qui lapsi sunt, aut graviora delicta admiserunt, nullam salutis a Domino consequendæ spem superesse existimarent. Namque ipsi eos ad pœnitentiam agendam sæpius hortari soliti fuerunt et admonere, ut se colligerent, et divinam indulgentiam supplices implorarent. Sed hoc tantum iis persuasum erat, et prædicatum, in ecclesiæ potestate non

accounted for this seeming difficulty in the Church's practice, which has so tortured the wits of other men for want of understanding wherein the true nature of the Novatian heresy consisted: some fancying that the Fathers in and before the Council of Eliberis were downright Novatians; others, that they allowed men reconciliation, and peace, and absolution, but only denied them the communion of the eucharist at their last hour: whereas nothing can be plainer, than that they denied them not only the communion, as it denotes the eucharist, but all manner of ministerial reconciliation, pardon, absolution, and readmission into the society of the faithful.

The rigour abated in after-ages without any reflection on the preceding practice.

6. This rigour indeed was abated in the practice of the following ages, but without the least reflection on those that went before them: because they were sensible it was at the Church's liberty to order this part of discipline according to her own prudence, and act as the circumstances of times and the state of affairs required; judging the times of peace to be different from the times of persecution, and that some abatement was to be made in this matter, when all the world was become Christian. The later Councils therefore are not so stiff in requiring the execution of the ancient canons in this particular, but allow every penitent communion at their last hour, though they would not undertake to assure them what effect an absolution in such extremity should have before God. The canons are very numerous upon this head: it will be sufficient to mention one or two as a specimen of all the rest.

The Council of Agde[98] speaks in general terms without exception: 'No penitents are to be denied their *viaticum*, (or *provision for their journey*,) at the point of death.' The first Council of Orange[99] also speaks as universally, making no distinction: 'Whoever accept of penance, when they depart from the body, let them be received to communion, but without the solemn imposition of hands, which is only to be given them, if they recover,

situm esse, ut quosvis post baptismum, quod unicum pœnitentiæ genus statuerunt, delinquentes ad fidelium communionem admitteret.

[97] Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 17. n. 3. (p. 213.) Cum enim Novatiani perperam assererent, non esse in ecclesia potestatem peccata post baptismum dimittendi, in quo, teste Paciano, eorum hæresis sita erat, non quod simpliciter negarent lapsis pœnitentiam, etc.

[98] C. 15. (t. 4. p. 1386 a.) Viaticum tamen omnibus in morte positis non est negandum.

[99] C. 3. See before, s. 3. n. 62, preceding.

upon performing their just penance in the church.' The fourth Council of Carthage [1] orders, 'that they shall have both the solemn imposition of hands, and the eucharist also, even though they had lost their senses or were struck dumb with their disease, if any about them could testify that they desired penance in their sickness.' And this was agreeable to the rule made in the great Council of Nice [2], 'that no one at the point of death should be deprived of his final and most necessary *viaticum,*' the eucharist or oblation, as it is explained in the close of the canon, where the bishop is made judge of his repentance. Upon this ground Synesius [3] says he never let any one go out of the world bound with the bonds of *anathema,* if they desired absolution: only if they recovered, he reserved them to the disposition of his metropolitan of Alexandria. And this confirms the remark made in general by Pope Innocent [4] upon the different practices of the Church in times of persecution and times of peace. The former observation was more severe, the latter more indulgent. In ancient times many sinners were denied communion at the hour of death: but in his time they granted penance to all, and admitted them to communion upon a death-bed repentance. Only they did not think this so safe as the performance of a regular penance in their life-time: and therefore they would not pronounce any thing confidently of their condition.

There goes an ancient homily under the name of St. Austin [5],

[1] C. 76. See ibid. n. 60, preceding.

[2] C. 13. (t. 2. p. 36 b.) Εἴ τις ἐξοδεύοι, τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου μὴ ἀποστερεῖσθαι.

[3] Ep. 67. ad Theophil. p. 252. (p. 215 b. 1.) Μηδεὶς γὰρ ἀποθάνοι δεδεμένος ἐμοί· ἀναρρυσθεὶς δὲ, πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὑπόδικος ἔστω, καὶ παρὰ τῆς θεσπεσίας σου, καὶ φιλανθρώπου ψυχῆς περιμενέτω τῆς συγγνώμης τὸ σύνθημα.

[4] Ep. 3. ad Exuperium, c. 2. See before, s. 4. n. 70, preceding.

[5] Hom. 41. ex 50. t. 10. p. 194. [al. Serm. 309.] (t. 5. p. 1507 e.) Agens pœnitentiam et reconciliatus cum sanus est, et postea bene vivens, securus hinc exit. Agens pœnitentiam ad ultimum et reconciliatus, si securus hinc exit, ego non sum securus.... Pœnitentiam dare possum, securitatem dare non possum.—Ibid. (p. 1508 b.) Numquid dico, damnabitur? Non dico. Sed nec dico etiam, liberabitur? Et quid dicis mihi? Nescio; non præsumo, non promitto, nescio. Vis te de dubio liberare? vis quod incertum est, evadere? Age pœnitentiam dum sanus es, et invenerit te novissimus dies, curre ut reconcilieris: si sic agis, securus es. Quare securus es? Quia egisti pœnitentiam eo tempore, quo et peccare potuisti. Si autem tunc vis agere pœnitentiam ipsam, quando jam peccare non potes, peccata te dimiserunt, non tu illa.

and it is also attributed to St. Ambrose[6], where this matter is thus delivered: 'If a man repents at his last hour, and is reconciled, and so dies, I am not secure that this man goes hence securely: I can admit him to penance, but I can give him no security. Do I say he shall be damned? I do not say it; but neither do I say he shall be saved. What then do I say? I know not, I presume not, I promise not. For I know not the will of God. Would you free yourself from all doubt, and avoid that which is uncertain? repent whilst you are in health, and you will be secure when your last day finds you: because you repent in a time when you had power to sin: but if you then only begin to repent, when you can sin no longer, it is not so much you that forsake your sins, as your sins forsake you.'

By all this it plainly appears that the Church used a liberty of discretion in treating sinners of the first rank, either with severity or tenderness, as she judged expedient for the ends of discipline, or the benefit and edification of the sinner.

What liberty was allowed to bishops in imposing penance, and exacting proper satisfaction from sinners. Some sinners allowed to do penance twice.

7. Indeed we may observe that a great latitude and liberty was allowed to bishops, who were the prime ministers of discipline, to render it more rigorous or easy, as they thought fit to regulate the exercise of it in their own discretion. For though it was necessary in general for sinners to demonstrate their repentance to the Church, in order to give her satisfaction, and gain themselves re-admission; yet the method of doing this was not so precisely prescribed, but that bishops had power to add to or abate something in the measures of it. Therefore though the general custom was to allow sinners to do public penance but once in the church, yet there are some instances, in the most strict and primitive ages, of sinners being admitted twice to this privilege. For Irenæus[7] says Cerdon the heretic more than once made confession of his heresy;

[6] Exhortat. ad Pœnitent. c. 28. (t. 2. append. p. 603 d, seqq.) Neque ita conversionis nostræ consilium temporis delectationibus prolongemus, &c. [Conf. Serm. 24. n. 2. (ibid. int. Spuria, p. 423 a.) O homo, ... quod fecisti malum, dum potes, emenda: dum tempus habes, &c. Ed.]

[7] L. 3. c. 4. (p. 206. 20.) Κέρδων δὲ, ... εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐλθὼν καὶ ἐξομολογούμενος, οὕτως διετέλεσε, ποτὲ μὲν λαθροδιδασκαλῶν, ποτὲ δὲ πάλιν ἐξομολογούμενος, ποτὲ δὲ ἐλεγχόμενος ἐφ' οἷς ἐδίδασκε κακῶς, καὶ ἀφιστάμενος τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν συνοδίας.

which we are to understand of his doing penance twice for his errors by making a public recantation of them. Tertullian[8] says the same of Valentinus and Marcion, that they were once and again cast out of the Church for their turbulent curiosity in corrupting the brethren, before they broke out into their last dissension, when they scattered the poison of their doctrines among the people. And yet after that Marcion did penance, and was to have been received into the communion of the Church again, upon condition that he should bring back those whom he had led into perdition; which he intended to do, but death prevented him. It is noted also by Socrates[9] concerning St. Chrysostom, that though a synod of bishops had decreed that lapsers should only be admitted once to do public penance, yet in his homilies he was used to tell men they should do it a thousand times, if occasion required, and be received to communion. Which bold doctrine displeased many of his friends, and Sisinnius the Novatian bishop wrote a book against it. After this a Council was held at Constantinople, anno 426 or 427, under another Sisinnius, the Catholic bishop, one of St. Chrysostom's successors, against the Massalian heretics, wherein it was decreed, that because they had often relapsed after doing penance, they should be admitted to do penance no more, though they made never so many solemn professions of repenting. The synodical epistle is recorded in Photius[10], from whence we learn that relapsers at this time were allowed to do penance again, though the Council thought

[8] De Præscript. c. 30. (p. 212 c.) .... Ob inquietam semper eorum curiositatem, quam fratres quoque vitabant [al. qua fratres quoque vitiabant], semel et iterum ejecti.... novissime in perpetuum discidium relegati, venena doctrinarum suarum disseminaverunt. Postmodum idem Marcion pœnitentiam confessus, cum conditioni datæ sibi occurrit, ita pacem recepturus, si cæteros [al. quoque], quos perditioni erudisset, ecclesiæ restitueret, morte præventus est.

[9] L. 6. c. 21. (v. 2. p. 339. 29.) *Μιᾶς γὰρ μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα παρὰ τῆς συνόδου τῶν ἐπισκόπων μετανοίας τοῖς ἑπταικόσι δοθείσης, αὐτὸς ἀπετόλμησεν εἰπεῖν, Χιλιάκις μετανοήσας εἴσελθε· ἐφ' ᾗ διδασκαλίᾳ πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ τῶν γνωρίμων αὐτοῦ κατέγνωσαν· μάλιστα δὲ Σισίννιος ὁ τῶν Ναυατιανῶν ἐπίσκοπος· ὃς καὶ λόγον ὑπεναντίον τοῦ λεχθέντος συνέγραψεν, καὶ γενναίως αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦτο κατέδραμεν.*

[10] Biblioth. cod. 52. (p. 40. 44.) *Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ συνοδικῇ ἐπιστολῇ καὶ Νέων ἐπίσκοπος ἐξεφώνησεν, ὡς εἴ τις μετὰ τὸν ἀναθεματισμὸν φωραθείη τῷ χρόνῳ, ἢ διὰ ῥημάτων, ἢ διὰ πραγμάτων, εἰς τὴν ὑποψίαν τῆς νόσου ταύτης ἐμπίπτων, μηκέτι λοιπὸν αὐτὸν χώραν ἔχειν, μὴ δ' ἂν μυριάκις ἐπαγγέλλεται τὴν τάξιν ἀναπληροῦν τῶν μετανοούντων.*

fit to deny the Massalian heretics the privilege any long because they had so often abused it.

Bishops had also power to moderate the term of penance upon just occasion.

8. Another instance of the power of bishops in this matt was the liberty which the canons themselves granted them moderate the term of penance, and shorten it, if they obser any extraordinary degree of zeal and sedulity in any penite that might deserve their indulgence and commiseration. T Council of Nice[11], determining the time of penance for such fell into idolatry, says, 'They shall be three years hearers, ten years prostrators, before they were admitted to commu cate in prayers with the people: but if any were more t ordinarily diligent in expressing their concern and tears, bringing forth good works, the true fruits of repentance should be in the bishop's power to *deal more gently and mil with them,—ἀνθρωπότερόν τι περὶ αὐτῶν βουλεύσασθαι,*— bring them to communicate in prayers sooner.' The order is given by the Council of Ancyra[12], 'that bishops s have power, upon examination and trial of the penitents' m ner of behaviour and conversion, *either to show them fav by shortening the time of penance, or otherwise to add t at his discretion,—ἢ φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι, ἢ πλείονα προστιθ χρόνον.*' So St. Basil[13] says, 'He that has the power of b ing and loosing, may lessen the time of penance to a peni that shows great contrition.' And Chrysostom[14] in answe some, who complained of the length of penance, that it tinued a year, or two, or three, says, 'I require not the tinuance of time, but the correction of the soul. Demonst your contrition, demonstrate your reformation, and all is d

[11] C. 12. (t. 2. p. 36 a.) *Ὅσοι μὲν γὰρ φόβῳ, καὶ δάκρυσι, καὶ ὑπομονῇ, καὶ ἀγαθοεργίαις, τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν ἔργῳ καὶ οὐ σχήματι ἐπιδείκνυνται· οὗτοι πληρώσαντες τὸν χρόνον τὸν ὡρισμένον τῆς ἀκροάσεως, εἰκότως τῶν εὐχῶν κοινωνήσουσι, μετὰ τοῦ ἐξεῖναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ φιλανθρωπότερόν τι περὶ αὐτῶν βουλεύσασθαι.*

[12] C. 5. (t. 1. p. 1457 e.) *Τοὺς δὲ ἐπισκόπους ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς δοκιμάσαντας φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι, ἢ πλείονα προστιθέναι χρόνον, πρὸ πάντων δὲ καὶ ὁ προάγων βίος, καὶ ὁ μετὰ ταῦτα, ἐξεταζέσθω· καὶ οὕτως ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπιμετρείσθω.*

[13] C. 74. [Oper. Basil. Ep. Canonic. Tert. (CC. t. 2. p. 175 *Ὁ πιστευθεὶς παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ λανθρωπίας λύειν καὶ δεσμεῖν, ε λανθρωπότερος γένοιτο, τὸ ὑπερ λον τῆς ἐξομολογήσεως ὁρῶν ἡμαρτηκότος, εἰς τὸ ἐλαττῶσα χρόνον τῶν ἐπιτιμίων, οὐκ ἔστι γνώσεως ἄξιος, κ. τ. λ.*

[14] Hom. 14. in 2 Cor. c. p. (t. 10. p. 542 a.).... *Οὐ τοῦτο χρόνου πλῆθος, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς δι σιν· τοῦτο τοίνυν ἐπίδειξον, εἰ ενύγησαν, εἰ μετεβάλοντο, καὶ τ γέγονεν.*

The Council of Lerida[15] very expressly: 'Let it remain in the power of the bishop either to shorten the suspension of the truly contrite, or to segregate the negligent a longer time from the body of the Church.' And the great Council of Chalcedon[16] leaves it entirely in the hands of every bishop in his respective Church, to show favour to such penitents at his own discretion.

And this was the true ancient notion of an indulgence.

9. And this is what some of the Ancients call *an indulgence;* which was not heretofore any pretended power of delivering souls from the pains of purgatory, by virtue of a stock of merits, or works of supererogation, which they of the Church of Rome call now *the Church's treasure,* of which the Pope is become the sole dispenser: but anciently an indulgence was no more than this power, which every bishop had, of moderating the canonical punishments, which in a course of penance were inflicted upon sinners, so that if the bishop saw any one to be a zealous and earnest penitent, he had liberty to shorten the time of his penance, that is, grant him a relaxation of some of his penitential exercises, and admit him sooner than others to communion. This was the true ancient notion of an indulgence. And that it was so, we may learn from one of the Epistles of Pope Vigilius[17], who writing to a certain bishop concerning some persons, who were under penance for suffering themselves to be re-baptized by the Arians, tells him, 'that it was left to his own judgment, and the judgment of other bishops in their respective dioceses, if they approved the quality and devotion of any penitents, to grant them the benefit of an indulgence,' that is, a relaxation of their penitential exercises, or a speedier admission to communion.

Which was sometimes granted at the inter-

10. And this was sometimes granted at the intercession of the martyrs in prison, of which there are several examples in Cyprian; and sometimes at the instance of the civil magistrate.

[15] C. 5. (t. 4. p. 1612 b.) Maneat in potestate pontificis, vel veraciter afflictos non diu suspendere, vel desidiosos prolixiore tempore ab ecclesiæ corpore segregare.

[16] C. 16. (ibid. p. 763 b.) 'Ωρίσαμεν δὲ ἔχειν τὴν αὐθεντίαν τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς φιλανθρωπίας τὸν κατὰ τόπον ἐπίσκοπον.—Vid. Martin. Bracarens. Capitul. Græc. Canon. c. 81. (CC. [c. 80.] t. 5. p. 914 b.). Conversatio autem et fides pœnitentis compendiat tempus.

[17] Ep. 2. ad Eleutherium, c. 3. (CC. ibid. p. 312 e.) In æstimatione fraternitatis tuæ aliorumque pontificum per suas diœceses relinquatur, ut si qualitas et pœnitentis devotio fuerit approbata, indulgentiæ quoque remedio sit vicina.

cession of the martyrs, or the instance of the civil magistrate.

For St. Austin[18] tells us, that as bishops were used to intercede for criminals in the civil courts, so the magistrates sometimes interceded for penitents in the ecclesiastical. And he uses this as an argument to a certain magistrate to induce him to show mercy to an offender: 'If you have liberty to intercede with us for the mitigation of an ecclesiastical censure, why may not the bishop intercede against your sword, when our sword is only drawn to make the man live better, but yours that he may not live at all?' This sort of indulgences therefore had no respect to the punishments of the next world, but only to the mitigation of ecclesiastical punishment in this: which is ingenuously acknowledged by Cassander[19], and several other learned Romanists[20], some of which have under—

[18] Ep. 54. p. 93. [al. 153.] ad Macedon. c. 4. (t. 2. p. 528 b.) Si ergo vobis fas est ecclesiasticam correptionem intercedendo mitigare, quomodo episcopus vestro gladio non debet intercedere, cum illa exseratur, ut in quem exseritur bene vivat, iste ne vivat?

[19] Consultat. Art. 12. p. 103. (p. 949.) Ex hoc ritu canonicarum pœnarum, quæ publice pœnitentibus ad certi temporis præscriptum imponebantur, natæ sunt indulgentiæ. Fas enim erat episcopis, animadversa vel diligentia vel impotentia et infirmitate pœnitentiæ, humanius et mitius cum illo agere, et de tempore illo et rigore pœnarum aliquid detrahere et imminuere: quæ pœnarum canonicarum imminutio et relaxatio, *indulgentia* dicebatur; quæ hodie ad privatas quoque satisfactiones traducta est, et ab episcopis ad solum pontificem Romanum plenum indulgentiarum tribuendarum jus delatum; circa quarum usum et praxin optimi quique correctionem et moderationem fieri desiderarunt, ut quæ, parum dextre tractata, hujus dilacerationis ecclesiæ præcipuam occasione dedere.

[20] Roffens. cont. Luther. art. 18. (p. 496. sub im.) Neque tam necessaria fuit sive purgatorii seu indulgentiarum fides in primitiva ecclesia atque nunc est. Nam tunc usque adeo caritas ardebat, ut paratissimi fuerint singuli pro Christo mortem oppetere. Rara fuerunt crimina, et ea, quæ contigerunt, magna fuerunt canonum severitate vindicata. Nunc autem bona pars populi magis Christianismum exueret, quam rigorem canonum pateretur; ut non absque maxima Sancti Spiritus dispensatione factum sit, quod post tot annorum curricula purgatorii fides et indulgentiarum usus ab orthodoxis generatim sit receptus, &c.—Polydor. Vergil. de Inventor. Rer. l. 8. c. 1. (p. 609.) Deinde [Gregorius] certos dies constituit, quibus in præcipuis urbis templis solemni ritu sacrificaretur, ibique pro illo sedando malo [peste videlicet] oraretur suppliciter: ac ut populus generatim simul frequentior eo illis statis diebus concurreret, proposuit delictorum veniam ad id solemne accedentibus, constitutis ad ipsa templa sacerdotibus, qui audirent volentes de peccatis suis confiteri, ut illi inde remissionem omnium delictorum consequerentur. Quæ sane consuetudo vel hodie servatur, ubicunque publica peccatorum venia promittitur. Et quia sacerdos potestatem habet tam culpam quam pœnam tollendi, hinc factum videtur, ut talis venia delictorum vulgo appelletur *indulgentia*, id est, remissio culpæ et pœnæ.—Alphons. a Castr. adv. Hæres. l. 8. p. 572. (Venet. 1546. p. 810.). Tunc magis

gone the censures of the Roman Inquisitors for their over liberal concessions. Particularly Polydore Vergil is put into the *Index Expurgatorius* for saying[21], 'that the use of indulgences is no older than the time of Gregory the Great;' and Franciscus Polygranus for asserting[22], 'that every bishop of divine right has power to grant indulgences,' with some assertions of the like nature; which agree very well with the true ancient notion of an indulgence, as it has been now explained, but will not comport with the Pope's sole claim and pretence to this power, or any other innovations in the modern practice. But this only by the way. I now return to the ancient Church.

Bishops had also power to alter the nature of the penalty in some measure, as well as the term of it.

11. Where we may observe further, that bishops had power to grant indulgence, not only by contracting the term of penance, but also in some measure by altering or lessening the nature and quality of the punishment itself. Of which we have a plain evidence in the Council of Ancyra[23], where, in the case of deacons, who lapsed into idolatry, and afterwards recovering, stood firm in a second engagement, it is ordered, 'that they may retain the honour of deacons, but not any part of their sacred service, either in ministering the bread or the cup, or in performing the office of the public directors in the church: yet the bishopsshould have power, if they found them very diligent, humble, and meek, to grant them more or less of their office, as they judged convenient:' which shows, that a great deal in this whole matter was left to the bishop's

fervebat Christianorum caritas, ut parum esset opus indulgentiis; plures anhelabant ad martyrium; pauca erant hominum scelera, et, si quod erat, gravissima canonum punitione emendabatur: hic in præsenti vita satis facere volebant; nihil volebant in futurum puniendum relinquere; quapropter non est mentio ulla indulgentiarum.

[21] Vid. Ind. Libr. Prohib. et Expurgand. Madrit. 1667. (p. 858. col. sinistr.)... Indulgentiarum quas vocant, etc. In indice rerum illa delenda: *Indulgentiæ quo tempore frequentari cœperint.* Indulgentias delictorum quis primo proposuerit, del. *primo.*

[22] Ind. Expurg. Salmur. 1601. (p. 97. summ.) Ex Fr. Polygrani Assertionibus quorundam Ecclesiæ Dogmatum. Fol. 68. pag. 2.... deleatur glossa marginalis, quæ ait *De jure divino quilibet sacerdos posset dare indulgentias.*

[23] C. 2. (t. 1. p. 1456 d.) Διακόνους .... θύσαντας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀναπαλαίσαντας, τὴν μὲν ἄλλην τιμὴν ἔχειν, πεπαῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν, ἢ κηρύσσειν· εἰ μέν τοι τινὲς τῶν ἐπισκόπων τούτοις συνίδοιεν κάματόν τινα ἢ ταπείνωσιν πρᾳότητος, καὶ ἐθέλοιεν πλεῖόν τι διδόναι ἢ ἀφαιρεῖν, ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

discretion, to make the exercise of penance more or less severe, as well in the degrees of punishment as in point of time, according to the disposition and behaviour of the repenting sinner,

What the Ancients mean by the term *legitima pœnitentia*.

12. And this explains to us a term or phrase which often occurs in the writings of the Ancients, especially in Cyprian[24] and the Council of Eliberis[25], and where they require that penitents should perform *pœnitentiam legitimam, plenam, et justam, a legal, full, and just penance.* Some understand by this, that they should fulfil the whole term or time of penance prescribed by the canons; others, that they should not only fulfil the time, but regularly go through all the several degrees of penance, as mourners, hearers, prostrators, and co-standers, before they were received to communion. But neither of these hit the true meaning of this ancient phrase, which respects neither the time of penance nor the orders of penitents, but the mind and qualifications of men acting sincerely and *bonâ fide* in their repentance; and expressing their hearty sorrow for sin by weeping, and mourning, and fasting, and almsdeeds, and charity, and an entire reformation; which are proper indications of a penitent mind, and such as might incline the bishop to show them some favour and indulgence, by shortening the time of their penance, notwithstanding which it might be called a just and full repentance, as Albaspinæus[26] rightly explains it.

What is meant by

13. There is one phrase more occurring in some of the an-

[24] Cypr. Ep. 54. [al. 57.] ad Cornel. p. 116. (p. 252.) Statueramus.. ut, qui in persecutionis infestatione supplantati ab adversario et lapsi fuissent, et sacrificiis se illicitis maculassent, agerent diu pœnitentiam plenam, &c.—Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 108. (p. 246.) Neque enim præjudicamus Domino judicaturo, quo minus, si pœnitentiam plenam et justam peccatoris invenerit, tunc ratum faciat quod a nobis fuerit hic statutum.

[25] C. 3. (t. 1. p. 971 a.)... Placuit in fine eis præstari communionem, acta tamen legitima pœnitentia.—C. 5. (ibid. b.) Post quinquennii tempora, acta legitima pœnitentia, ad communionem placuit admitti. Conf. cann. 14, 62, 76.

[26] Observat. l. 2. c. 30. (ad calc. Optat. p. 95 c.) A nonnullis, &c.—Vid. Not. in c. 3. C. Eliber. (CC. t. 1. p. 989 e.) Ut pœnitentia censeretur legitima, non satis erat explere tempus constitutum ab episcopo, ut volunt Garsias et Binius: sed ea legitima vocabatur, quam bona fide ducebant pœnitentes, et cum domi, et in ecclesia, noctu et interdiu, perpetuis ærumnis sese exercerent, et lacrymis, fletibus, et multis præterea signis animi dolorem clam et publice testarentur. Illegitima autem dicebatur, quando pœnitentes languidius eam subirent, et parum dolerent de peccatis, quamvis præscriptum tempus explerent.

cient canons, which may need a little explication in this place, because it relates to the severity of the ancient discipline, which we are now considering.

the phrase *inter hyemantes orare.*

The Council of Ancyra[27], speaking of those who commit uncleanness with beasts, or draw others into the same sin, being spiritual lepers and infecting others with their contagion, says, 'they shall pray with the χειμαζόμενοι, or *hyemantes;*' which denotes some extraordinary punishment, but of what sort is not very easy to determine, because learned men are not well agreed what the word χειμαζόμενοι properly means. The old translators of the Greek canons commonly understand it of *energumens,* or *demoniacs,* such as were vexed with unclean spirits, and, as it were, *tossed by them in a tempest.* Dionysius Exiguus[28] renders it, *Qui spiritu periclitantur immundo, vexed with an unclean spirit.* The other translation of Isidorus Mercator[29] has it, *Qui tempestate jactantur, qui a nobis energumeni intelliguntur, those that are tossed in a tempest, by whom we understand energumens.* And Martin Bracarensis, in his Collection of the Greek Canons[30], renders it *dæmoniosos, demoniacs.* And that which gives some probability to this interpretation is, that the word χειμαζόμενοι is so used and expounded by many Greek writers. In the prayer for the whole state of the Church, and all orders in it, related by the author of the Constitutions[31], there is one petition, Ὑπὲρ τῶν χειμαζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, *For those who are tossed by the enemy;* that is, *energumens* vexed with the Evil Spirit. And so Cyril of Alexandria[32] uses the same phrase for those that were possessed with a wicked spirit. As also the ancient commentators, Maximus upon Dionysius[33], and

[27] C. 17. (t. 1. p. 1462 e.) Τοὺς ἀλογευσαμένους καὶ λεπροὺς ὄντας, ἤτοι λεπρώσαντας, τούτους προσέταξαν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος εἰς τοὺς Χειμαζομένους εὔχεσθαι.

[28] [Ed. Prim. c. 16. ap. Crabb. t. 1. p. 202. Ap. Labb. (t. 1. p. 1468 c.) Qui spiritu, &c.

[29] Ed. Secund. c. 17. ap. Crabb. ibid. Ap. Labb. (ibid. p. 1474 c.) Qui tempestate jactantur, qui a nobis energumeni appellantur.—Ibid. in margine: *Furiosi sive energumeni intelliguntur.* Ed.]

[30] C. 82. (CC. [c. 81.] t. 5. p. 914 c.) Oportet tales inter dæmoniosos orare, al. ordinare.

[31] L. 8. c. 12. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 403.) Ἔτι παρακαλοῦμέν σε καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν χειμαζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου.

[32] In Esai. 42. (t. 2. p. 544 c.)... Χειμαζόμενοι ὑπὸ πνεύματος πονηροῦ.

[33] In Dionys. Hierarch. Eccles. c. 6. (t. 2. p. 82 c. 8.) Τῶν χειμαζομένων καὶ ἐνεργουμένων.

Alexius Aristenus upon the Canons[34], and the modern Greeks in their *Euchologium*[35], where there is a prayer for the χειμαζόμενοι ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, *those that are tossed* or *tormented with unclean spirits*. Upon the credit of which authorities Bishop Beveridge[36] concludes, that praying among the χειμαζόμενοι or *hyemantes* in the Council of Ancyra denotes the penitents praying among *the energumens*, or *those that were vexed with unclean spirits*. And so Osiander, in his Notes upon the Council of Ancyra[37], and Mr. Dodwell[38], in his Observations upon Cyprian, who thinks the word *clidomeni*, in one of Cyprian's Epistles[39], is but a corruption from *clydonizomeni*, κλυδωνιζόμενοι, which is of the same import and significa-

[34] In c. 17. C. Ancyr. (ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 1. p. 394 f.) Χειμαζόμενοι δέ εἰσι κατὰ τὸν μέγαν Διονύσιον, οἱ ὑπὸ πνεύματος πονηροῦ κατεχόμενοι.

[35] Goar. (p. 724.) Εἰς παράκλησιν ἀσθενῶν χειμαζομένων ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων καὶ ἐπηρεαζόντων.

[36] Not. in c. 11. C. Nicæn. n. 4. (t. 2. append. p. 72.) Hic etiam in narthece, &c.

[37] Collect. Canonum. Wittebergæ, 1614. 4to. (ap. Epitom. Hist. Eccles. cent. 4. p. 34.) Qui a Diabolo correpti misere concutiebantur, per intervalla tamen ad Deum suspirabant, energumeni vocabantur. Hi ad preces, &c.

[38] Dissert. 1. in Cypr. s. 17. p. 4. (ad calc. Oper. Cypr. p. 7.) . . . Propius tamen ad MSS. fidem accedet, si pro clydomeni *clydonizomeni* legamus, et de energumenis sive maniacis intelligamus, qui *lymphatici* Latinis, χειμαζόμενοι Græcis quoque patribus audiunt. Idem enim valet primaria quoque significatione χειμαζόμενοι quod κλυδωνιζόμενοι.

[39] [Juxt. Ed. Pamel. Ep. 3. Juxt. Ed. Oxon. 1682. Ep. 8. (p. 18.) Sive viduæ, sive *thlibomeni*, qui se exhibere non possunt, &c.—This is surely the correct reading. See Bp. Fell's note on the place, at the end of which he justifies it thus: Quod ad vocem præsentem attinet, probata lectio est illa, quam adhibemus; cui fidem facit Epistola Cornelii ad Fabium, ... ubi consimili occasione mentio habetur χηρῶν καὶ θλιβομένων. *Se exhibere*, esse ad vitam necessaria sibi suppeditare ostendimus, l. 3. ad Quirin. c. 61. The Benedictine Editor (Venet. 1728, col. 27.) reads *clinomeni*, and writes thus in the annotation: Codex meus habet *domeni*. Gratianopolitanus *chlidomeni*. Morellius posuit *clydomeni*, Latinius et Rigaltius *clinomeni*. Postea secuta est Editio Anglicana, in qua, rejectis cæteris lectionibus, absque ulla veterum librorum auctoritate, tantum ex conjectura sumpta ex Epistola Papæ Cornelii ad Fabium episcopum Antiochenum, quæ Græce exstat apud Eusebium, [H. E. l. 6. c. 43.] scriptum est *thlibomeni*: et, quanquam ea lectio videatur esse bona, transferenda tamen non erat in contectum absque majori auctoritate: nam reliquæ lectiones possunt etiam esse bona . . . . Porro quos Græci vocant *thlibomenos*, Ruffinus vertit *indigentes*, Baronius *fluctuantes* valde diverso sensu. However, I cannot but think with Bp. Fell, that *thlibomeni* is the true reading, while it evidently makes the best sense. Compare also b. 5. ch. 6. s. 3. v. 2. p. 185. n. 2, citing Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43., and note, that for χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις, κ. τ. λ. another reading has χήρας συνθλιβομένας. Ed.]

h χειμαζόμενοι, denoting what the Latins call *maniaci* ıphatici, *persons possessed by an evil spirit*, as he ıut of some passages of Amphilochius[39] and St. Chry- o, which support his conjecture. Other learned men ıe χειμαζόμενοι, or *hyemantes*, were such penitents as monstrous greatness of their crimes were not only ex- ıut of the communion of the Church, but cast out of the *rium* or courts and porch of the church, and put to do ı in the open air, where they stood exposed to the in- y of all weathers whatsoever.

opinion is embraced and defended by Albaspinæus[41], ıl Bona[42], and Suicerus[43]. And there is a passage in

m. de Pœnitent. ap. Com- 97 d. 2.) Προσερχόμενοι γὰρ ‹εσι, καὶ τοῖς κλυδωνιζομένοις, μάγοις, καὶ φαρμάκοις, ἐξαι- ‹αὶ κατὰ ἀνθρώπων δαίμονας. ıt. 1. ad Stagyrium. (t. 1. .) Σαυτὸν δὲ ἐν χαλεπῷ τῷ λεπωτάτῳ] κλύδωνι κείμενοι λ.

ıserv. in c. 17. C. Ancyr. ι. p. 1479 c.) Qui ob gravia 'erbi gratia, fornicationis aut , pœnitentiam agebant, aut ɛbant; certum est sub quo- tulo pro templi foribus eos enitentiæ, et exomologesim e, id est, presbyteris advo- ıris Dei martyribus adgeni- veniam deprecatos esse, cæ- nique fratres, ut sibi depre- essent, orasse: verum qui , delicta, ut sunt ea, quæ anonibus commemorantur, ɛrant, quique perpetuam a- ɔœnitentiam, non solum ab , sed ab illo tectulo arceban- ɔs hic *hiemantes* vocari ex- et inter eos, hos impudicos ı orare juberi. *Hiemantes* dici videntur, vel quia ab tulo semoti, sub dio orare itentiam agere cogerentur, ɛ quia in ecclesiæ portum m reciperentur, ut ait Bal-

ır. Liturg. l. 1. c. 17. n. 5.) Nam Synodus Ancyrana, prosos, et eos qui cum brutis ıuerunt, inter hiemantes ora- re præcepit. At qui fuerint isti, dubiæ quæstionis est. Quidam putant fuisse arreptitios, quos S. Maximus, in Scholiis ad cap. 6. Eccles. Hier., ita vocari arbitratur, quod veluti tempestatibus agitati in continua quasi hieme versarentur. Horum vero sententiam reprobat Zonaras, in Notis ad citatum canonem Ancyranum: *Sed qui sint*, inquit, *haud facile dixerim*. Alii collocant eos in primo ordine pœnitentium, nullumque agnoscunt discrimen inter hiemantes et lugentes. Quibusdam magis placet hiemantium nomine illos intelligi, qui sub dio extra omne ecclesiæ tectum manebant, cujusmodi erant majori excommunicatione percussi, ab ecclesia prorsus præcisi: quo etiam in loco, procul scilicet a porticu, jussi sunt stare leprosi, ne cæteros interficerent [al. inficerent]; et qui cum brutis atque contra naturam luxuriabantur, quos monstra, portenta, et furias nuncupabant. Horum autem conjecturam ideo censeo probabiliorem, quod illi favere videatur Tertullianus, Lib. de Pudicitia, apud quem aliud est limine ecclesiæ, aliud toto tecto submoveri.— See n. 44, following.

[43] Thes. Eccles. voce, Χειμαζόμενοι. (t. 2. p. 1508.) Alii χειμαζομένους eos esse dicunt, qui pro templi foribus, sub dio, orare et pœnitentiam agere cogebantur. Qui ob gravia delicta, ut est fornicatio aut adulterium, pœnitentiam agebant, aut eam petebant,

Tertullian[44], which makes this explication look very natura for, speaking of the ancient discipline, and distinguishing tl degrees and malignity of heinous offences, he says, 'there we some impious furies of lust, so far transgressing all the laws nature, both with respect to bodies and sex, that they did not on expel them from the doors of the church, but from any cover place belonging to it, as being monsters rather than comm vices.' Either of these opinions, as having each their reaso and probability to support them, may be admitted. But tl opinion of Balsamon[45] here is little worth, who makes tl *hyemantes* to be no more than the second class of peniten called *hearers*. This does by no means show any special s verity against such enormous sins, assigning them only a co mon punishment with the rest. But if we suppose those, w were guilty of them, either to be ranked among demoniacs, wholly to be kept out of the Church, we have some proper id of the Church's severity against them; for which reason I ha purposely mentioned it in this place, where we have been d coursing of the strictness and severity of the ancient discipli which is the last thing considerable in the exercise of it, whi men were under the bonds and fetters of excommunicati The next thing is to see how they were loosed from th bonds, when their penance was completed; and this brings to the business of absolution, or the method of re-admitting p nitents into the communion of the Church again, which m be the subject of the next Book.

sub quodam tecto pro templi foribus eos pœnitentiæ ritus et exomologesin peragebant, id est, presbyteris advolvebantur, caris Dei adgeniculabantur, veniam deprecabantur, cæteros denique fratres, ut sibi deprecatores essent, orabant. Verum qui graviora delicta, ut sunt quæ hoc canone commemorantur, commiserant, quique perpetuam agerent pœnitentiam, non solum ab ecclesia, sed ab illo etiam tecto arcebantur, qui hic χειμαζόμενοι videntur appellari. Tertulliani verba de Pudicitia, c. 4. extremo: *Reliquas, &c.* (See the note following.) Atque hæc verissima videtur esse sententia.

[44] De Pudicit. c. 4. (p. 557 Reliquas autem libidinum furias i pias et in corpora et in sexus ul jura naturæ, non modo limine, rum omni ecclesiæ tecto submo mus, quia non sunt delicta, monstra.

[45] [In c. 17. C. Ancyr. (Bevereg. Pandect. t. 1. p. 394 Χειμαζόμενοι τοίνυν κληθήσονται ρίως οἱ ἐν τῇ νάρθηκι ἱστάμενοι, ἀκροώμενοι τῶν θείων Γραφῶν, τόπ ἐπέχοντες χειμαζομένων, καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησιαστικὸν λιμένα τῆς σωτηρ εἰσελθεῖν μὴ παραχωρούμενοι. ED

BOOK XIX.

OF ABSOLUTION, OR THE MANNER OF RE-ADMITTING PENITENTS INTO THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH AGAIN.

CHAP. I.

Of the nature of absolution, and the several sorts of it; more particularly of such as relate to the penitential discipline of the Church.

All church-absolution only ministerial, not absolute.

1. HAVING hitherto seen the exercise of penitential discipline in all the several parts of it, as it related to sinners under the bonds of excommunication, we are now to consider it under another view, as it denotes their absolution from those bonds by the power of the keys, and the method of restoring or re-admitting penitents, when their penance was completed, to the communion of the Church again.

And here first of all we are to observe, that the Ancients challenged no power in this matter but that, which was purely ministerial; leaving the absolute, sovereign, independent, and irreversible power only to God. Of which I need give no other proof at present but only this, that they constantly made it an argument for our Saviour's divinity, 'that he had the sovereign power of forgiving sins:' which argument could have signified nothing, had men been equal sharers in this power with him. Thus Irenæus argues against some of the heretics in his own

time: 'Our Saviour,' says he[1], 'in forgiving sins, both cured the man, and manifestly declared who he himself was. For if none can forgive sins but God alone, and our Lord did forgive them, and cure men, it is manifest that he was the Word of God, made the Son of man: and as he was man, he suffered with us and for us; as he is God, he shows mercy to us, and forgives us our debts, which we owe to God our Maker.' The same argument is urged by Tertullian[2], in his Books against Marcion; and by Novatian[3] against the Ebionites, and Athanasius[4] against the Arians. St. Basil[5] also uses it as one of his strongest weapons against Eunomius; and the like is done by St. Hilary[6], and St. Chrysostom[7], and St. Jerom[8], and Victor

[1] L. 5. c. 17. (p. 426. 19.) Peccata igitur remittens, hominem quidem curavit, semetipsum autem manifeste ostendit quis esset. Si enim nemo potest remittere peccata nisi solus Deus; remittebat autem hæc Dominus, et curabat homines: manifestum est, quoniam ipse erat Verbum Dei, Filius hominis factus ... Et quo modo homo compassus est nobis, tanquam Deus misereatur nostri, &c.

[2] Cont. Marcion. l. 4. c. 10. (p. 421 d.) Nam cum Judæi solummodo hominem ejus intuentes, nec dum et Deum certi, qua Dei quoque Filium, merito retractarent, non posse hominem delicta dimittere, sed Deum solum; cur non secundum intentionem eorum de homine eis respondebit [al. respondit], Habere eum potestatem dimittendi delicta, quando et Filium hominis nominans hominem nominaret? nisi quia ideo ipsa voluit eos appellatione Filii hominis ex instrumento Danielis repercutere, ut ostenderet Deum et hominem, qui delicta dimitteret, illum scilicet solum, Filium hominis apud Danielis prophetiam, consecutum judicandi potestatem, ac per eam utique et dimittendi delicta.

[3] De Trinit. c. 13. (ap. Galland. t. 3. p. 296 c.) Quod si, cum nullius sit nisi Dei, peccata dimittere, idem Christus peccata dimittit .... merito Deus est Christus.

[4] Orat. 3. cont. Arian. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 467 e. n. 40.) .... *Ἁμαρτίας ἠφίει, λέγων τῷ παραλυτικῷ, καὶ τῇ τοὺς πόδας ἀλειψάσῃ γυναικὶ, Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· καὶ νεκροὺς μὲν ἤγειρε·.... καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίει, οὐ μέλλων ἕως λάβῃ, ἀλλ' ἐξουσιαστὴς ὤν.* —Ep. de Synodis. (t. 1. part. 2. p. 609 c. n. 49.) *Περὶ μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ φησὶν ὁ Ἠσαΐας· Τίς Θεὸς, ὥσπερ σὺ, ἐξαίρων ἀνομίας, καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἀδικίας· ὁ δὲ Υἱὸς ἔλεγεν οἷς ἤθελεν, Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· ὅτε καὶ, τῶν Ἰουδαίων γογγυζόντων, ἔργῳ τὴν ἄφεσιν ἐδείκνυε, λέγων τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Ἔγειραι, ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου, καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου.*

[5] Cont. Eunom. l. 5. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 425 c.) *Εἰ τοίνυν οὐδενός ἐστιν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, ὥσπερ οὐκ ἔστιν, εἰ μὴ μόνον Θεοῦ, ἀφίησι δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, Θεὸς ἄρα τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐνεργείας τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ.*

[6] In Matth. c. 8. (t. 1. p. 705 c. n. 6.) Movet scribas remissum ab homine peccatum: hominem enim tantum in Jesu Christo contuebantur. Et remissum est ab eo, quod lex laxare non poterat; fides enim sola justificat. Deinde murmurationem eorum Dominus introspicit, dicitque facile esse Filio hominis in terra peccata dimittere. Verum enim nemo potest dimittere peccata, nisi solus Deus: ergo qui remittit, Deus est. Quia nemo remittit nisi Deus, Deus in homine manens curationem homini præstabat.

[7] Hom. 29. al. 30. in Matth. (t. 7. p. 343 e.) *Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ ἔλεγον,*

of Antioch[9], and Cyril of Alexandria[10], who all argue for our Saviour's divinity from this topic, 'that he had sovereign and absolute power upon earth to forgive sins.' And St. Ambrose[11] uses the same argument against the Macedonians to prove the divinity of the Holy Ghost. I produce none of these testimonies at large here, both because they all speak the same thing, and are already produced in an excellent book of Bishop Usher's[12], which is common in every reader's hands: where he also shows further the general agreement of the Ancients in this assertion, 'that none can forgive sins but God only;' that

ὅτι λύειν ἁμαρτήματα Θεοῦ μόνον ἐστίν· οὗτος δὲ οὐ λύει μόνον ἁμαρτήματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἕτερόν τι ἐπιδείκνυται, ὃ Θεοῦ μόνον ἦν, τὸ τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἀπόρρητα ἐκφέρειν.

[8] In Matth. 9. (t. 7. p. 49 a.) Legimus in Propheta dicentem Deum: *Ego sum, qui deleo iniquitates tuas.* Consequenter ergo scribæ, quia hominem putabant, et verba Dei non intelligebant, arguunt eum blasphemiæ. Sed Dominus videns cogitationes eorum, ostendit se Deum, qui possit cordis occulta cognoscere, et quodam modo tacens loquitur: *Eadem majestate et potentia, qua cogitationes vestras intueor, possum et hominibus peccata dimittere.*

[9] In Marc. 2. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 4. p. 374 h. 4.) At quorsum Servator, signum patraturus, præmittit, *Ut autem sciatis, quia Filius hominis habet potestatem in terra dimittendi peccata?* Haud alia de causa istud facit, quam et planum hinc fiat, divinitatis vim, propter indivulsam utriusque unionem, in humanam quoque naturam sese diffundere, &c.

[10] Thesaur. l. 12. c. 4. [assert. 12.] (Lutetiæ, 1638. t. 5. part. 1. p. 110 e.) . . . . Ὁ Πατὴρ ἀφίησιν ἁμαρτίας. Ποιεῖ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Υἱός· Ἵνα γάρ, φησιν, (Matth. 9, 6. Luk. 5, 24.) εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας.—Grischovius, (v. 8. p. 188. n. k.) unable to verify this citation, observes,—*In Editione Paris.* 1638, *quam ego habeo, et qua usus quoque est Binghamus, hic Thesaurus nec libros habet nec capita, adeoque falsa allegatio. Inveni autem locum Commentar. in Joan. c. 20. 23. l. 12. c. 1.* (t. 4. p. 1101 b.) qui huc referri potest.—Δοὺς δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα Χριστὸς, Ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφέωνται, φησίν· ἂν τινων κρατῆτε, κεκράτηνται· καίτοι μόνου τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ὄντος Θεοῦ δυναμένου τε καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος ἀπολύειν ἁμαρτίας τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας· τίνα γὰρ ἂν καὶ προσήκοι τὸ χαρίζεσθαί τισι τὰ ἐφ' οἵσπερ ἂν ἁλοῖεν εἰς τὸν θεῖον πλημμελήσαντες νόμον, εἰ μὴ τῷ τὸν νόμον ὁρίσαντι.—How Grischovius could have overlooked the place in Cyril's Thesaurus, which I have easily found, I know not. But this is not the only instance in which I have proved my ancestor's citations *perfectly correct*, where they have been marked, too hastily by others, as *vague* or *erroneous*. See also n. 17, following. ED.]

[11] De Spirit. Sanct. l. 3. c. 18. (t. 2. p. 693 b. n. 133, et f. n. 137.) Peccata quoque nemo condonat, nisi unus Deus, quia æque scriptum est, *Quis potest peccata donare, nisi solus Deus?* . . . . . Videamus, utrum peccata donet Spiritus. Sed hic dubitari non potest, cum ipse Dominus dixerit, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum: quorum remiseritis peccata, remissa erunt, &c.*—Conf. Augustin. Hom. 23. ex 50. [al. Serm. 99.] c. 7. (t. 5. p. 524 c.) . . . Tenete, quia homo non potest peccata dimittere. Illa, quæ sibi a Christo peccata dimitti credidit, Christum non hominem tantum, sed et Deum credidit.

[12] Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 79, &c. (Works, v. 3. pp. 119, seqq.) Of the priest's power to forgive sins.

is, with an absolute and sovereign power: and therefore the power of absolution in the Church is purely *ministerial*, and consists in the due exercise and application of those means, in the ordinary use of which God is pleased to remit sins: using the ministry of his servants, as stewards of his mysteries, in the external dispensation of them; but himself conferring the internal grace or gift of remission by the operation of his Spirit only upon the worthy receivers.

These mysteries or means of grace, in the external dispensation of which the Church is concerned, and in the ordinary use of which remission of sins is conveyed, are usually by the Ancients reckoned up under these five heads: 1. The absolution or great indulgence of baptism. 2. The absolution of the eucharist. 3. The absolution of the word and doctrine. 4. The absolution of imposition of hands and prayer. 5. The absolution of reconcilement to the Church and her communion by a relaxation of her censures. The two first may be called *sacramental absolution;* the third, *declaratory absolution;* the fourth, *precatory absolution;* the fifth, *judicial absolution;* and all of them *authoritative*, so far as they are done by the ministerial authority and commission which Christ has given to his Church, to reconcile men to God by the exercise of such acts and means as conduce to that end, in a subordinate and ministerial way, according to his appointment.

1. Of the grand absolution of baptism. That this was of no use in penitential discipline to persons once baptized.

2. But then all these sorts of absolution were not reckoned of equal concern in penitential discipline. For though baptism was always esteemed the most universal absolution, and grand indulgence in the ministry of the Church; as conveying a general pardon of sins to every true member of Christ, when he first entered into his mystical body by the laver of regeneration: yet this had no place in the exercise of penitential discipline. For no penitent was ever reconciled to the communion of the Church, after any lapse, or censure, or penance done for it, by a second baptism. And yet the stewards of Christ's mysteries were always supposed to have the ministerial power of conveying remission of sins to men by the administration of baptism: and so far as they were entrusted with the administration of it, so far they had power to bind or loose; to admit the worthy into the Church, or keep the unworthy out of it; that is, in the ministerial way, to remit men's sins by admitting

ıem to baptism, or retain their sins by keeping them from it, :cording to the rules of Christ's institution and appointment. 'he Ancients upon this account commonly give baptism the ame of *indulgence*, or *remission of sins*, or *the sacrament of emission*, as I have had occasion to show out of the Council of 'arthage, under Cyprian, and one of the Roman Councils men-.oned by Cotelerius, and St. Austin, in a former Book[13], where 'e treat more expressly of baptism. It is also observable, that he Ancients commonly deduce this ministerial power of remit-ng sins in baptism from the same text, upon which the power f all other absolutions is founded, viz. (John 20, 23.) "Whose-oever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose-oever sins ye retain, they are retained." They say, this com-ıission is executed by the ministers of Christ, as well in con-:rring baptism, as in reconciling penitents, or any other way f ministerial absolution.

Cyprian argues upon this foot against the baptism of heretics nd schismatics, that baptism given by them is of no benefit to ıe receiver, because they are not of the number of those to hom Christ gave commission to remit sins, as not being en-ued with the Holy Spirit. 'Seeing,' says he[14], 'that remis-on of sins is granted to every man in baptism, the Lord in is Gospel declares and proves, that sins can only be remitted y them who have the Holy Spirit. For after the resurrection, 'hen he sent forth his disciples, he said unto them, "As my 'ather sent me, so send I you. And when he had said this, he ›reathed on them, saying, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose-oever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose-oever sins ye retain, they are retained." In which place he ıhows, that they only can baptize, and grant remission of sins, who have the Holy Ghost.' So again in another Epistle[15]: "It

[13] B. 11. ch. 1. s. 2. v. 4. p. 2. ın. 1, 2.

[14] Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magnum. p. 185. (p. 297.) .... Cum in baptismo unicuique peccata sua remittuntur, probat et declarat in Evangelio suo Dominus, per eos solos peccata posse dimitti, qui habeant Spiritum Sanctum. Post resurrectionem enim discipulos suos mittens, loquitur ad eos et dicit: Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos. Hoc cum dixisset, insufflavit et ait illis: Accipite Spiritum Sanctum. Si cujus remiseritis peccata, remittentur illi: si cujus tenueritis, tenebuntur. Quo in loco ostendit, eum solum posse baptizare, et remissionem peccatorum dare, qui habeat Spiritum Sanctum.

[15] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 201. (p. 308.) Manifestum est autem ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari possit, quæ in baptismo scilicet da-

is manifest both where and by whom that remission of sins is granted, which is granted in baptism. For the Lord first gave that power to Peter, that whatsoever he loosed on earth should be loosed in heaven. And after his resurrection, he said to his disciples, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Whence we understand, that no other have power to baptize, and grant remission of sins, but they who are made rulers in the Church by the evangelical law and ordinance of the Lord.' Firmilian[16] also follows Cyprian in the same argument, proving from the same texts that heretics have no power to remit sins in baptism, because they are not in the Church, nor of the number of those to whom Christ gave that commission.

Neither was it only Cyprian and Firmilian that thus asserted the power of remitting sins in baptism to belong to the ministers of Christ, but generally all other interpreters. Cyril of Alexandria[17], expounding those words of our Saviour, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, &c.," says, 'Spiritual men remit or retain sins, as I conceive, two ways. For either they call those to baptism who are worthy of it upon the account of a good life and approved faith, or else they forbid and repel those from

tur. Nam Petro primum Dominus.. potestatem istam dedit, ut id solveretur in cœlis, quod ille solvisset in terris. Et post resurrectionem quoque ad Apostolos loquitur, dicens, Sicut misit me Pater, &c.... Unde intelligimus, non nisi in ecclesia præpositis, et in Evangelica lege et Dominica ordinatione fundatis, licere baptizare, et remissam peccatorum dare.

[16] Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 225. (p. 324.) Qualis vero error sit, et quanta sit cæcitas ejus, qui remissionem peccatorum dicit apud synagogas hæreticorum dari posse, nec permanet in fundamento unius ecclesiæ, quæ semel a Christo supra petram solidata est; hinc intelligi potest, quod soli Petro Christus dixerit: *Quæcunque ligaveris, &c.*: et iterum in Evangelio, quando in solos Apostolos insufflavit Christus dicens, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum, &c.* Potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est, et ecclesiis, quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et episcopis, qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt.

[17] L. 12. in Ioan. 20, 23. (t. 4. p. 1101 d.) Ἀφιᾶσί γε μὴν ἁμαρτίας· ἤ τοι κατέχουσιν οἱ πνευματοφόροι, κατὰ δύο τρόπους, κατά γε διάνοιαν ἐμήν· ἢ γὰρ καλοῦσιν ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τοὺς, οἷς ἂν ἤδη καὶ τούτου τυχεῖν ὠφείλετο διὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου σεμνότητα καὶ τὸ δεδοκιμασμένον εἰς πίστιν. Ἡ διακωλύουσί τινας, καὶ τῆς θείας χάριτος ἐξείργουσιν ἔτι οὔπω τέως γεγονότας ἀξίους. Ἢ καὶ καθ' ἕτερον τρόπον ἀφιᾶσί τε καὶ κρατοῦσιν ἁμαρτίας, ἐπιτιμῶντες μὲν ἁμαρτάνουσι τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνοις, μετανοοῦσι δὲ συγγινώσκοντες· καθάπερ ἀμέλει καὶ Παῦλος τὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ πορνεύσαντα παρεδίδου μὲν εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ· προσίετο δὲ αὖθις, ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῇ.

the divine gift who are unworthy of it. This is one way of remitting or retaining sin. Another way is, when they punish and correct the children of the Church offending, and pardon them again upon their repentance: as Paul delivered the Corinthian over to the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved; and afterward received him, that he might not be swallowed up of overmuch sorrow.' St. Ambrose[18] in like manner ascribes the power of remitting sins to the administration of baptism, as well as penance: and upon this ground he asks the Novatians, 'Why do ye baptize, if sins cannot be remitted by the ministry of man? what is the difference, whether priests assume this power as given to them in the exercise of penance, or the administration of baptism?' Gaudentius[19] says, 'It is this key of the sacraments that opens the gate of the kingdom of heaven.' Consequently he must mean also, that so far as ministers are instrumental in conferring the sacrament of baptism, so far they are instrumental in procuring men that remission of sins which attends it. And for this reason Chrysostom[20] magnifies the sacerdotal office upon a double account, 'because the priests have power to remit sins, both when they regenerate us, and afterwards:' that is, both by baptism and penance, when they first admit men into the Church, and re-admit or reconcile them after any great transgression. But I mention this, not so much to explain the penitential discipline of the Church, in which baptismal absolution thas no concern, as to remark a few other necessary things.

As, first, that sacerdotal absolution in general extends much further than is commonly apprehended: for it includes the whole transaction of baptism, whereby remission of sins is ministerially granted to every true member of Christ when he is first admitted into his Church. Whence it follows, secondly,

[18] De Pœnitent. l. 1. c. 8. t. 1. p. 157. (t. 2. p. 400 b. n. 36.) Cur baptizatis, si per hominem peccata dimitti non licet? .... Quid interest, utrum per pœnitentiam, an per lavacrum, hoc jus sibi datum sacerdotes vindicent?

[19] Tractat. 16. Die Ordinationis suæ: ap. Bibl. Patr. Paris, 1654. t. 2. p. 59. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 5. p. 968 f. 5.) Janua quippe regni cœlorum non nisi hoc sacramentorum spiritualium [al. spirituali] clave reseratur.

[20] De Sacerdot. l. 3. c. 6. (t. 1. p. 384 e.) Οὐ γὰρ ὅτ' ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀναγεννῶσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συνχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἁμαρτήματα.—See also afterwards, n. 29, following.

that sacerdotal absolution does not necessarily require any particular or auricular confession of private sins; forasmuch as that the grand absolution of baptism was commonly given without any particular confession. And therefore the Romanists vainly found the necessity of auricular confession upon those words of our Saviour, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them:" as if there could be no absolution without particular confession; when it is so plain that the great absolution of baptism, the power of which is founded by the Ancients upon this very place, required no such particular confession. Thirdly, we may hence infer that the power of any sacerdotal absolution is only ministerial: because the administration of baptism, which is the most universal absolution, so far as man is concerned in it, is no more than ministerial. All the office and power of man in it is only to minister the external form, but the internal power and grace of remission of sins is properly God's: and so it is in all other sorts of absolution. Therefore though baptismal absolution be no part of penitential discipline, yet by observing these things in it, we shall more easily discern the true nature of those other absolutions, which have some relation to the penitential discipline of the Church.

2. Of the absolution granted by the eucharist.

3. The first of these, though we may call it the second in the general consideration of absolutions, was the absolution that was given by the ministry of the eucharist. This had some relation to penitential discipline, but did not solely belong to it. For it was given to all baptized persons, who never fell under penitential discipline, as well as those who lapsed, and were restored to communion again. And in both respects it was called the τὸ τέλειον, *the perfection* or *consummation* of a Christian; there being no higher mystery than an ordinary Christian could partake of. To those who never fell into such great sins as required a public penance, it was an absolution from lesser sins, which were called *venial*, and *sins of daily incursion:* and to penitents who had lapsed, it was an absolution from those greater sins for which they were fallen under censure. That it was esteemed such a general absolution in both cases, we learn from the characters which the Ancients give of it both at large and with a particular respect to its loosing the bonds of excommunication.

Cyprian[20] says in general, 'that when we drink the blood of the Lord and the cup of salvation, we put off the remembrance of the old man, and forget our former secular conversation; and our sorrowful and heavy heart, which before was pressed with the anguish of our sins, is now absolved or set at liberty by the joyfulness of the divine indulgence or pardon.' And more particularly that it was esteemed an absolution, as it resolved the bonds of excommunication without any other formality or ceremony of receiving the penitent into the communion of the Church, we learn from that order made in the first Council of Orange[21], that such penitents as are ready to leave the body, shall have the communion without the reconciliatory imposition of hands: which, as we shall see by and by, was the usual and ordinary ceremony in reconciling penitents publicly at the altar, and what these were to have afterwards if they happened to survive. In the mean time this sort of communion, the eucharist taken without imposition of hands, was sufficient for the consolation or reconciliation of a dying person, according to the decrees of the Fathers, who congruously call this sort of communion their *viaticum*, or *provision for their journey*. The fourth Council of Carthage has two canons implying the same thing. The first[22] says, 'If a penitent is struck dumb in his sickness, and is thought to be at the point of death, he shall be reconciled both by imposition of hands, and by the eucharist put into his mouth.' And the other[23] grants the eucharist as an absolution by itself to penitents in sickness, if they chance to die; only providing, 'that in case they recover they shall not hold themselves absolved without imposition of hands also: because in case they

[20] Ep. 63. ad Cæcil. p. 153. (p. 279.) .... Epoto sanguine Domini, et poculo salutari, exponatur [al. exponitur] memoria veteris hominis, et fiat [al. fit] oblivio conversationis pristinæ sæcularis; et mœstum pectus ac triste, quod prius peccatis angentibus premebatur, divinæ indulgentiæ lætitia resolvitur.

[21] C. 3. (t. 3. p. 1448 d.) Qui recedunt de corpore, accepta pœnitentia, placuit, sine reconciliatoria manus impositione eos communicare, quod morientis sufficit consolationi [al. reconciliationi], secundum definitiones Patrum, qui hujusmodi communionem congruenter *viaticum* nominaverunt.

[22] C. 76. (t. 2. (p. 1206 a.).... Si continuo creditur moriturus, reconcilietur per manus impositionem, et infundatur ori ejus eucharistia.

[23] C. 78. (ibid. b.) Pœnitentes, qui in infirmitate viaticum eucharistiæ acceperint, non se credunt absolutos sine manus impositione, si supervixerint.

survived, they were obliged to perform the residue of their penance, which they should have done before, and then be reconciled by imposition of hands publicly at the altar; but if they died, the eucharist alone was a sufficient absolution for them.' And this is confirmed by that memorable story, related by Eusebius[24] out of an Epistle of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, concerning one Serapion, an aged man, who had led a virtuous life, but happened at last to lapse into idolatry in time of persecution. He had often sued for pardon, but no one would hearken to him, because he had sacrificed to idols. Afterward falling sick, he sent for one of the presbyters to come and absolve him in the night. The presbyter himself was sick, and could not go to him: but because the bishop had given in charge that absolution should be granted to all that were at the point of death, if they desired it, and especially if they had earnestly desired it before, that they might have hope and consolation in their last minutes, when they were about to leave the world, the presbyter sent him a little portion of the eucharist by the boy that came for him, bidding him to dip it in liquor, and put it into his mouth. Which he did, and presently the man expired. Upon which Dionysius himself makes this remark: 'That it was apparent that God preserved him, and continued him so long in life, till he might be absolved, and have his sins blotted out, and be owned by Christ for the many good deeds he had done.' I need make no other reflection upon the story, since Dionysius tells us so plainly that to minister the eucharist to men was to grant

[24] L. 6. c. 44. (v. 1. p. 316. 24.) Σεραπίων τις ἦν παρ' ἡμῖν πιστὸς γέρων· ἀμέμπτως μὲν τὸν πολὺν διαβιώσας χρόνον, ἐν δὲ τῷ πειρασμῷ πεσών. Οὗτος πολλάκις ἐδεῖτο, καὶ οὐδεὶς προσεῖχεν αὐτῷ, καὶ γὰρ ἐτεθύκει. Ἐν νόσῳ δὲ γενόμενος, τριῶν ἑξῆς ἡμερῶν ἄφωνος καὶ ἀναίσθητος διετέλεσε· βραχὺ δὲ ἀνασφήλας τῇ τετάρτῃ προσεκαλέσατο τὸν θυγατριδοῦν· καὶ μέχρι τίνος φησὶν, Ὦ τέκνον, με κατέχετε; δέομαι σπεύσατε, καί με θᾶττον ἀπολύσατε· τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μοί τινα κάλεσον· καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν πάλιν ἦν ἄφωνος. Ἕδραμεν ὁ παῖς ἐπὶ τὸν πρεσβύτερον· νὺξ δὲ ἦν· κἀκεῖνος ἠσθένει· ἀφίκεσθαι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἐδυνήθη· ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης, τοὺς ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι, ἵν' εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται· βραχὺ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἐπέδωκεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ, ἀποβρέξαι κελεύσας, καὶ τῷ πρεσβύτῃ κατὰ τοῦ στόματος ἐπιστάξαι. Ἐπανῆκεν ὁ παῖς φέρων·... ἀπέβρεξεν ὁ παῖς, καὶ ἅμα τε ἐνέχεε τῷ στόματι· καὶ μικρὸν ἐκεῖνος καταβροχθίσας εὐθέως ἀπέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα· ἄρ' οὐκ ἐναργῶς διετηρήθη καὶ παρέμεινεν, ἕως λυθῇ, καὶ, τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐξαλειφθείσης, ἐπὶ πολλοῖς οἷς ἔπραξε καλοῖς ὁμολογηθῆναι δυνηθῇ;

them absolution, and remission of sins, and peace and favour with Christ, when it was given in his name to worthy receivers. And thus it was that the ministers of Christ, as his ambassadors, were always supposed to have the ministerial power to remit sins, and reconcile penitents to Christ, by this sacramental absolution.

3. Of absolution declaratory and effective by the administration of the word and doctrine.

4. The third sort of absolution is that of the word and doctrine, which is partly declarative, and partly operative and effective; and is of use both in penitential discipline and out of it. For the ministers of Christ, as his ambassadors, have commission and authority to make a general and public declaration of the terms of reconciliation and salvation to men. And this is also ministerially operative in working faith and repentance in men's souls, which are the terms of salvation, whereby they obtain remission of sins: for "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." [Rom. 10, 17.] They have also power to declare to men in particular, that they are in a salvable state, when, upon the best human judgment that they can make, they apprehend and discern in them the necessary conditions of salvation. This is that key of knowledge whereby they open to men the gate of heaven, and the way to eternal life, procuring for them the remission of sins, and all the benefits of the Gospel-covenant. It is this that introduces men at first into God's favour, and ascertains them of it; and when they are fallen from that state by wilful sin, it is a means, as a part of the Church's penitential discipline, to reduce them back again to their forfeited estate and primitive condition. Upon which account *hearing of the word of God*, as we have seen before[24], was always one station of penitents in the Church, and was an initiatory sort of reconcilement of them to God, introductory to the great and last reconcilement at the altar. And in this sense, the Ancients say, Christ gave his disciples power to remit sins. 'Every man,' says St. Jerom[25], 'is bound in the cords of his own sins: which cords and bonds the Apostles have power to loose, imitating their master, who said

[24] B. 18. ch. 1. s. 4. p. 98, preceding.

[25] In Esai. 14, 17. (t. 4. p. 255 a.) Funibus peccatorum suorum unusquisque constringitur: quos funes atque vincula solvere possunt et Apostoli, imitantes magistrum suum, qui eis dixerat, *Quæcunque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in cœlo.* Solvunt autem eos Apostoli sermone Dei, et testimoniis Scripturarum, et exhortatione virtutum.

unto them: "Whatsoever ye loose upon earth shall be loosed in heaven." Now the Apostles loose them by the word of God, and testimonies of Scripture, and exhortation unto virtue.' In like manner St. Ambrose[26] says, 'Sins are remitted by the word of God, whereof the Levite is the interpreter, and a sort of executor: and in this respect the Levite is the minister of remission.' 'It is the key of the word,' says Maximus Taurinensis[27], 'which opens the conscience to confession of sins, and includes therein the grace of the mystery of salvation unto eternity.' Thus ministers are said to be instrumental in reconciling men to God, and procuring them remission of sins, because to them is committed the word of reconciliation.

4. Of the precatory absolution given by imposition of hands and prayer.

5. The fourth sort of absolution was that of intercession and prayer, which was used as a concomitant of most other absolutions. For baptism and the eucharist were either administered in a precatory form, or at least prayers and intercessions for pardon of sins always attended them: and so they did also the great and solemn reconciliation of penitents at the altar. And to prayer they commonly joined imposition of hands, a rite and ceremony of benediction that was used in all offices of religion. By this persons were at first admitted to the state of catechumens, and by this trained up in their preparation for baptism. By this persons were confirmed in the close of baptism. By this ordinations were given to the clergy, and benedictions to all the people. And Albaspinæus[28] has observed,

[26] De Abel et Cain, l. 2. c. 4. (t. 1. p. 212 f. n. 15.) Remittuntur peccata per Dei verbum, cujus Levites interpres, et quidam executor .... Levites igitur minister remissionis est.

[27] Hom. 5. de Natali Petri et Pauli. p. 321. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 6. p. 36 d. 10.)... Clavis, inquam, quæ et conscientiam ad confessionem peccati aperit, et gratiam ad æternitatem mysterii salutaris includit.

[28] Observ. l. 2. c. 31. (ad calc. Optat. p. 96 b.) Prima manus impositio, quam pœnitentes sortiebantur, erat ea, qua peragendæ pœnitentiæ copia facultasque daretur. Secunda, quam in tertio gradu pœnitentiæ consequebantur. Cum enim solemne missæ sacrificium instaurabatur, certo in ecclesiæ loco aderant, iisque in terram dejectis ante Evangelii recitationem ejusque expositionem, si priora sæcula respicias, episcopi manus imponebant, et super eos certas precationum formulas pronuntiabant. Tertia vero erat simplex illa reconciliatio, quam a tertio gradu ad quartum discedentes impetrabant, qua corporis Christi mystici communioni et societati fidelium conjungebantur, omni adeo in re, si oblationes et eucharistiam excipias. Quarta et ultima erat absoluta reconciliatio, maxima et perfecta, qua digni, qui eucharistiam sumerent, oblationem præsentarent, eorumque participes fierent, reddebantur; quod unum tantumque beneficium summi boni loco Christiani numerabant.

'that in the course of public penance this ceremony was at least four times used towards all that went through it, before they were completely reconciled and admitted to full communion. First, they were admitted to penance by imposition of hands: secondly, they had frequent imposition of hands whilst they were penitents in the order of kneelers or prostrators: thirdly, they were admitted to the lower degree of communion in prayers only without the oblation by the same rite: and, lastly, imposition of hands was one of the solemn rites of admitting them to the more perfect degree of reconciliation at the altar.'

Now though prayer and imposition of hands was not esteemed an absolution in all these cases, yet in many of them it certainly was. For Chrysostom[29], speaking of the several powers of the sacerdotal office and the methods of expiating sin, says, the priests do it 'not only by their doctrine and admonition, but also by the assistance of their prayers: they have power of remitting sins not only when they regenerate us in baptism, but afterwards. For St. James [5, 14 and 15.] says, "Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."' Pope Leo after the same manner makes sacerdotal absolution to consist in prayer. 'The assistances of divine goodness,' says he[30], 'are so ordained, that the divine indulgence is not to be obtained but by the supplications of the priests. And it is very useful and necessary that the guilt of sin should be loosed by the supplications

[29] De Sacerdot. l. 3. c. 6. t. 4. p. 35. (t. 1. p. 384 d.) Οἱ μὲν γὰρ εἰς ταυτην, οἱ δὲ εἰς ἐκείνην γεννῶσι. Κἀκεῖνοι μὲν οὐδὲ τὸν σωματικὸν αὐτοῖς δύναιντ' ἂν ἀμῦναι θάνατον, οὐ νόσον ἐπενεχθεῖσαν ἀποκρούσασθαι. Οὗτοι δὲ καὶ κάμνουσαν καὶ ἀπόλλυσθαι μέλλουσαν τὴν ψυχὴν πολλάκις ἔσωσαν· τοῖς μὲν πραοτέραν τὴν κόλασιν ἐργασάμενοι, τοὺς δὲ οὐδὲ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀφέντες ἐμπεσεῖν. Οὐ τῷ διδάσκειν μόνον καὶ νουθετεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ δι' εὐχῶν βοηθεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ ὅτ' ἂν ἡμᾶς ἀναγεννῶσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα συγχωρεῖν ἔχουσιν ἐξουσίαν ἁμαρτήματα. Ἀσθενεῖ γὰρ τίς, φησιν, ἐν ὑμῖν, προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, κ. τ. λ.

[30] Ep. 89. al. 91. ad Theodor. (CC. t. 3. p. 1403 a.).... Sic divinæ bonitatis præsidiis ordinatis, ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri.... Ibid. (c.) Multum enim utile ac necessarium est, ut peccatorum reatus ante ultimum diem sacerdotali supplicatione solvatur.

of the priests before the last day.' Here remission of sins is plainly ascribed to the efficacy of intercession and prayer. St. Austin says, the prayers of holy men in the Church procure remission of sins both in baptism and penance. For he argues thus[31]: 'If the prayers of holy men in the Church procure remission of sins for those, who are baptized not by the dove but by the hawk, that is, not by good but by wicked men, if they come to that sacrament in the peace of Catholic unity: why should not the prayers of the same men loose the sins of those who return from heresy or schism to Catholic unity?' He adds a little after[32], 'that the prayers of the saints, that is, the mournings of the dove, grant remission of sins to those that are baptized in the peace of the Church, whatever the person be that administers baptism, whether he be a covetous man or an extortioner, because he only acts in the person of the Church, by whose prayers remission of sins is obtained.' Therefore he exhorts the Donatists in another place[33], 'to return to the peace of the Church, where by the joint prayers of two people united they might obtain remission of sins: for the Lord had said, "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." [Matth. 18, 19.] If for two men, how much more for two people! therefore let us jointly fall down to supplicate the Lord: do you partake with us in unity, and let us partake with you in sorrow, that charity may cover the multitude of sins.' Here again we see, remission of sins is ascribed to prayer. And so Cyprian understood it when he thus addressed himself to those that had lapsed into

[31] De Bapt. l. 3. c. 17. (t. 9. p. 117 d.) An forte per orationes sanctorum spiritualium, eorum etiam peccata solvantur, qui non per columbam, sed per accipitrem baptizantur, si ad illud sacramentum cum pace Catholicæ unitatis accedunt? Quod si ita est, cur non ergo per eorum orationes, cum quisque ab hæresi aut schismate ad pacem Catholicam venit, ejus peccata solvuntur?

[32] C. 18. (ibid. p. 118 d.) Remissam tamen peccatorum non dabant [scil. raptores et avari], quæ per orationes sanctorum, id est, per columbæ gemitus datur, quicunque baptizet, si ad ejus pacem illi pertinent, quibus datur.

[33] L. 2. c. 13. (ibid. p. 106 e.) Multum valet ad propitiandum Deum fraterna concordia. *Si duobus ex vobis*, ait Dominus, *convenerit in terra, quicquid petieritis, fiet vobis*. Si duobus hominibus, quanto magis duobus populis? Simul nos Domino prosternamus, participamini nobiscum unitatem, participemur vobiscum dolorem, et caritas cooperiat multitudinem peccatorum.

idolatry[34]. 'We pray you to repent, that we may be able to pray to God for you: we first turn our prayers to you, that we may turn the same to God, and beseech him to have compassion on you.' Eusebius[35] after Clemens Alexandrinus, notes this to have been the method whereby St. John obtained pardon of Christ for the young man, who after a pious education in the Church was become a most notorious robber upon the mountains: 'he interceded with Christ by frequent prayers and fastings, and thereby restored him, a great example of repentance to the Church.' And thus Tertullian[36], whilst he was a Catholic, represents Christ as 'joining his intercession with the tears of the Church, and thereby obtaining pardon for the penitent sinner.' The first Council of Orange[37] appoints this to be the way of reconciling heretics, who desire to become Catholics at the point of death: 'If the bishop was not at hand, the presbyters were to consign them with chrism, and the benediction: which benediction was the same as imposition of hands and prayer.' For as imposition of hands, by a figure, always implies prayer with imposition of hands, as an outward sign or ceremony accompanying prayer: so both these together are what the Ancients always mean by a benediction. So that when the Council bids those, who are baptized in heresy, 'to be reconciled to the Church, or absolved by a benediction,' it is plain that prayer is understood as the proper means of their absolution. And it is the same thing as is ordered in other canons[38], 'that heretics so baptized should

[34] De Lapsis, p. 136. (p. 97.) Rogamus vos, ut pro vobis Deum rogare possimus. Preces ipsas ad vos prius vertimus, quibus Deum pro vobis, ut misereatur, oramus.

[35] L. 3, c. 23. ex Clem. A. Tract. Quis dives salvetur? (v. 1. p. 115. 9.) .... Καὶ δαψιλέσι μὲν εὐχαῖς ἐξαιτούμενος .... οὐ πρότερον ἀπῆλθε, ὥς φασι, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἀποκατέστησε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· διδοὺς μέγα παράδειγμα μετανοίας ἀληθινῆς, καὶ μέγα γνώρισμα παλιγγενεσίας, τρόπαιον ἀναστάσεως βλεπομένης.

[36] De Pœnitent. c. 10. (p. 127 d.) Æque illi cum super te lacrymas agunt, Christus patitur, Christus Patrem deprecatur. Facile impetratur semper, quod Filius postulat.

[37] C. 2. [al. 1.] (t. 3. p. 1447 b.) Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderent, si desit episcopus, a presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placet.

[38] C. 17. (t. 4. p. 1013 b.) Bonosiacos,...quos baptizari in Trinitate manifestum est, ... cum chrismate et manus impositione.... recipi sufficit.—Conf. Leon. Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 16. (CC. [Respons. ad Inquisit. 18.] t. 3. p. 1409 a.) .... Per manus impositionem, invocata virtute Spiritus Sancti, quam ab hæreticis accipere non potuerunt, Catholicis copulandi sunt.—Siric. Ep. 1. ad Himer. c. 1. (CC. t. 2. p. 1018 b.) Quos nos cum Novatianis aliisque hære-

be received into communion 'by chrism and imposition of hands,' that is, unction to consign or confirm them with the Spirit which was wanting in their heretical baptism, and prayer with imposition of hands to give them the peace and communion of the Church.

Of which way of reconciling and absolving penitent heretics, who were baptized out of the Church, we shall have occasion to discourse a little more distinctly hereafter[38]. Here I only add further the testimony of St. Ambrose[39], who says, 'the priests execute that commission, which is given by Christ, (John 20, 23.) for remitting of sins, as intercessors by their prayers: they make request, but God bestows the gift: the service is human, but the bounty of forgiveness is from the power above.' So that if this be not the only way whereby the ministers of Christ are empowered to remit sins, as some of the Schoolmen themselves have determined, yet it was certainly one way, and that of general use in the primitive Church, as is clearly evident from the present allegations, and will be made more apparent in the sequel of this discourse.

5. Of the judicial absolution of penitents by restoring them finally to the peace and full communion of the Church.

6. For prayer had a considerable share in the great and final absolution of penitents, when after they had performed their canonical penance they were solemnly reconciled and received to the peace and perfect communion of the Church at the altar. This was that famous way of remitting sins and absolving sinners of which we read so much in the monuments of the Fathers and Councils, where they speak of penitential discipline and absolution of sinners. This is what is generally meant by those ancient phrases, 'granting them peace,' 're-

ticis, sicut est in synodo constitutum, per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, episcopalis manus impositione, Catholicorum conventui sociamus.—Innoc. Ep. 2. ad Victric. c. 8. (CC. ibid. p. 1251 c.) Ut venientes a Novatianis vel Montensibus per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur.—Ep. 18. ad Alexandr. c. 3. (CC. ibid. p. 1269 d.) Arianos præterea, cæterasque hujusmodi pestes, quia eorum laicos conversos ad Dominum, sub imagine pœnitentiæ ac Sancti Spiritus sanctificatione per manus impositionem suscipimus, &c. —Ep. 22. c. 4. (CC. ibid. p. 1274 b.) Nostræ lex est ecclesiæ, venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sint, per manus impositionem laicam tantum tribuere communionem.

[38] Ch. 2. ss. 7—9. pp. 201—208.

[39] De Spir. Sanct. l. 3. c. 19. [al. c. 18.] (t. 2. p. 693 f. n. 137.) Homines autem in remissionem peccatorum ministerium suum exhibent, non jus alicujus potestatis exercent. Neque enim in suo, sed in Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti nomine peccata dimittunt. Isti rogant, divinitas donat; humanum enim obsequium, sed munificentia supernæ est potestatis.

storing them to communion,' 'reconciling them to the Church,' 'loosing their bonds,' 'granting them pardon and indulgence,' and 'remitting their sins,' which are but so many different ways of expressing this one thing, viz., the solemn manner of absolving public penitents and admitting them to full communion when their canonical penance was regularly performed. And this comprehended all the other ways of absolution, except that of baptismal absolution. For as I noted before, [in the opening of the second section of this chapter,] no penitent that had once been regularly baptized was ever admitted to communion by a second baptism: but they had the absolution of prayer and imposition of hands, and the absolution of the eucharist, and the declaratory absolution of the word and doctrine: for solemn prayer was made to God for them to procure their absolution from him; and the solemn imposition of hands was given them to signify their reconciliation; and the eucharist was immediately given them to restore them to the communion of the altar; and by the whole a declaration was made that they were now again in the society and peace of the Church, and in favour with God, as far as human understanding could make any judgment of them. And upon this account some ancient writers acknowledge no other sorts of absolution but only two; the baptismal absolution, which is antecedent to all penitential discipline; and this of reconciling public penitents to the communion of the altar: because this latter comprehends all the other ways of absolution in the several acts and ceremonies that were used in the conferring of it. Thus we have heard before[40] Cyril of Alexandria expounding those words of the commission, (John 20, 23.) "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them." He says, 'Spiritual men remit or retain sins two ways: for either they call those to baptism who are worthy of it upon the account of a good life and approved faith; or else they forbid and repel those from the divine gift who are unworthy of it. This is one way of remitting or retaining sins. The other way is, when they correct and punish the children of the Church offending, and pardon them again upon their repentance.'

Now because the ministers of Christ are in a great measure the proper judges of men's qualifications, both for baptism and

[40] See n. 17, preceding.

the eucharist, therefore a great power and authority was allowed them in both these cases to examine into men's behaviour and faith, and to judge who were fit and who were not fit for the reception of them; and accordingly to minister or not minister to them those mysteries which were the means of conveying remission of sins to the worthy receiver; and so they were invested with a sort of absolute judicial authority in the external administration of these things with respect to the outward communion of the Church, though not with an absolute authority over the conscience in respect to God, who alone can properly remit sin and absolve the sinner. So they acted in a double capacity in these matters; as judges in respect of men's visible qualifications for the sacraments, and the proper time and season of admitting them to the participation of them; having power to shorten or prolong the time as they judged of the negligence or proficiency of the petitioning parties: but they acted only as intercessors to God for them, as to any thing pertaining directly and properly to the purification of the conscience from sin, which is not in man's power, but only in a ministerial way to do those things which as means of grace may contribute towards obtaining a proper absolution and remission of sins from God, in whose power only is the absolute power of forgiving sins.'

This is the true state of the matter as to what concerns the several sorts of absolution in use in the ancient Church, and particularly that absolution which was given to public penitents upon their restoration to communion; the manner and ceremonies of which, with other incidental circumstances, I shall now go on a little further to explain.

CHAP. II.

Of the customs, rites, and circumstances anciently observed in the public absolution of sinners.

No sinners anciently absolved till they had performed their regular penance, except in

1. When sinners had performed their regular penance, and carefully gone through the several stages of discipline appointed for the distinct orders of penitents in the Church, they were then admitted to complete and perfect communion by the great and last reconciliatory absolution. But this was anciently granted to none before they had orderly completed the full

term of their penance, unless it was in case of imminent death, when their desperate case made it reasonable to treat them a little more favourably, and grant them an indulgence, which no consideration but that extraordinary exigence could procure them. Indulgences were not then bought and sold, as they were most shamefully in after-ages: much less was bare confession sufficient to gain a man absolution, before he had done a formal and serious penance to the satisfaction of the Church.

case of imminent death.

The Audian heretics indeed were very faulty in this matter, as Theodoret[41] informs us, for they not only assumed to themselves a despotic authority like the Donatists, to pardon sins by their own power, but also hastily granted remission upon a bare confession, without staying for any fruits of repentance, or prescribing any time for the public manifestation of them, as the laws of the Church always required. And there were some presbyters of the Church in Cyprian's time who for favour or filthy lucre were much inclined to admit lapsers, without any just penance done, in a very hasty and preposterous manner to communion. And the martyrs, by their artifices and frauds, were many times induced to intercede to the bishops for such sinners, and almost demand of them an immediate re-admission of the offenders. But Cyprian very sharply remonstrates against this usurpation and abuse in several Letters[42], written both to the clergy, and the martyrs, and the people themselves, wherein he sets forth both the

[41] De Hæret. Fabul. l. 4. c. 10. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 365.) *Οὗτοι ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων ποιεῖσθαι νεανιεύονται. Διχῇ γὰρ τὰς ἱερὰς βίβλους μετὰ τῶν νόθων διελόντες, διαφερόντως γὰρ ταύτας νομίζουσιν ἀποκρύφους καὶ μυστικὰς, καὶ, στιχηδὸν ἔνθεν καὶ ἔνθεν τεθεικότες, διαβαίνειν ἕκαστον μεταξὺ τούτων κελεύουσι, καὶ τὰ πλημμεληθέντα ὁμολογεῖν· εἶτα τοῖς ὡμολογηκόσι δωροῦνται τὴν ἄφεσιν· οὐ χρόνον ὁριζόμενοι εἰς μετάνοιαν, καθὰ κελεύουσιν οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεσμοὶ, ἀλλ' ἐξουσίᾳ ποιούμενοι τὴν συγχώρησιν.*

[42] Ep. 10. [al. 16.] ad Cler. p. 37. (p. 194.) ... Quando decipiatur fraternitas nostra a quibusdam vestrum, qui, dum sine ratione restituendæ salutis plausibiles esse cupiunt, magis lapsis obsunt.—Ibid. (p. 195.)... Decipit miseros; ut, qui possunt, agentes pœnitentiam veram, Deo qua patri et misericordi precibus et operibus suis satisfacere, seducantur ut magis pereant; et qui erigere se possent, plus cadant, &c.—Ep. 11. [al. 15.] ad Martyr. p. 34. (p. 193.) ... Ante actam pœnitentiam, ante exomologesim gravissimi atque extremi criminis factam ... offerre pro illis et eucharistiam dare ... Ea enim concedere, ... decipere est. Nec erigitur sic lapsus, sed per Dei offensam magis impellitur ad ruinam.—De Lapsis, p. 128. (p. 92.) Non concedit pacem facilitas ista, sed tollit: nec communionem tribuit, sed impedit ad salutem.

irregularity and the danger of the practice; telling the people particularly, that this indulgent facility in the clergy to grant them such a preposterous peace did not really give them peace but destroy it; nor grant them true communion, but only hinder their salvation. And St. Ambrose[43] makes a like reflection on the vanity of those who seek for such a sudden restoration. 'Some men,' says he, 'desire to be admitted to penance only for this reason, that they may presently receive the communion again. These men do not so much desire to be absolved themselves as to bind the priest: for they retain their evil conscience; and therefore the priest sins greatly in admitting men who give no signs of repentance to communion against the laws of the Church.

There was one case indeed in which men might be reconciled privately, when they had not perfectly gone through their whole course of penance; which was, when they lay sick and despaired of upon a death-bed: but that was an extraordinary case, and the only exception that the general rule admitted of; and was only a private and not a solemn and public reconciliation: and even in that case, as I have shewn before[44], the canons provided, that if the sick man recovered he should perform the residue of his penance in the regular course appointed for public penitents, before he was solemnly reconciled at the altar. So that the custom of absolving sinners in health, before any penance is done, must be determined to be not only a novelty, but a great abuse and corruption of the ancient discipline, wholly owing to the degeneracy of latter ages.

Penitents publicly reconciled in sackcloth at the altar.

2. As to the manner of the ancient reconciliation, it was usually thus performed. When a sinner had gone through the course of his penance he was brought to the altar in the same habit that he had performed his penance in, that is, in sackcloth, and there with solemn prayers and tears and imposition of hands received to full communion. The circumstance of sackcloth is mentioned by the first Council of Toledo[45]; and

[43] De Pœnitent. l. 2. c. 9. (t. 2. p. 434 f. n. 87.) Nonnulli ideo poscunt pœnitentiam, ut statim sibi reddi communionem velint. Hi non tam se solvere cupiunt, quam sacerdotem ligare: suam enim conscientiam culpa non exuunt, et sacerdotis induunt, cui præceptum est, *Nolite sanctum dare canibus, neque miseritis margaritas vestras ante porcos.*

[44] Ch. 4. s. 3. p. 147, preceding.

[45] C. 2. (t. 2. p. 1224 a.) ... Publicam pœnitentiam gerens sub cilicio, divino fuerit reconciliatus altario.

the place of reconciliation said to be the altar, not only by that Council but by Optatus[46], who speaking to the Donatists, and of their way of reconciling penitents, which was the same as was used in the Catholic Church, tells them, that at the same time that they laid hands on sinners, and remitted their sins, they turned to the altar and said the Lord's Prayer. And so St. Jerom[47] says, the bishop enjoins the people common prayer when he reconciles any one, who had been delivered over unto Satan, to or at the altar.

Sometimes more publicly before the *apsis* or *reading desk.*

3. Yet in some cases, when the crime was very public, and more than ordinarily notorious and scandalous to all the people, the criminal for example's sake received his absolution in a more public place, before the *apsis*, or *reading-desk*, in the open body of the church, and in the view of all the people. This we learn from a canon of the third Council of Carthage[48] inserted into the African Code[49], which says, 'that if any penitent's crime be public, or vulgarly known to all, so as to have given scandal to the whole Church, he shall receive imposition of hands, (that is, his absolution,) before the *apsis*.' Learned men indeed are not exactly agreed about the sense of this canon: Du Fresne[50], after Balsamon and Zonaras, takes the *apsis* for *the church-porch;* and Zonaras[51] says, the imposition

[46] Optat. l. 2. p. 57. (p. 52.) Inter vicina momenta, dum manus imponitis, et delicta donatis, mox ad altare conversi, Dominicam orationem prætermittere non potestis.

[47] Dialog. cont. Lucifer. c. 2. [al. 5.] (t. 2. p. 175 a.) ... Sacerdos ... indicta in populum oratione altario reconciliat.

[48] C. 32. (t. 2. p. 1171 e.) Cujuscunque pœnitentis publicum et vulgatissimum crimen est, quod universam ecclesiam commoverit [al. universa ecclesia noverit], ante apsidem [al. absidem*] manus ei imponatur.

[49] C. 43. (ibid. p. 1070 e.) Οὐτινος δήποτε δὲ μετανοοῦντος, εἰ πούβλικον καὶ τεθρυλλημένον ἐστὶ τὸ ἔγκλημα, τὸ σύμπασαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν κινοῦν, πρὸ τῆς ἀψῖδος τούτῳ ἡ χεὶρ ἐπιτεθῇ.

[50] Comment. in Paul. Silentiar. p. 537. (ap. Byzant. Hist. Scriptor. t. 13. p. 204. n. 20. col. dextr.) Ita porro ἀψῖδα interpretatur Zonaras in canone 46. Concil. Carthag.: Τὸ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς ἀψῖδος, πρὸ τοῦ προπυλαίου ἐστίν. Unde cum in Synodo 3. Carthaginiensi, can. 32., cavetur, *ut iis, quorum crimina publica sunt, ante absidem manus imponatur:* id videtur intelligendum de abside narthecis, ubi consistebant pœnitentes, non vero de absida, seu concha altaris.

[51] [In c. citat., qui est c. 46. C. Carth. ap. Bevereg. Pand. (t. 1. p. 569 a.) Διὸ τοῖς τοιούτοις καὶ ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθέναι, καὶ ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς μετανοοῦντας ὁ κανὼν διατάττεται, ὥσπερ ἔξω τῶν ἱερῶν περιβόλων ἑστάναι καὶ προσκλαίειν· τὸ γὰρ πρὸ τῆς ἀψῖδος πρὸ τοῦ προπυλαίου ἐστίν. Ed.]

* [Vid. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. voce Ἀψίς. (t. 1. p. 612. n. 2.) Latinis patribus dicitur *absis* vel *absida*, &c. Ed.]

of hands means the first imposition that admitted them to penance: Albaspinæus[52] thinks the *apsis* means the same as the *ambo* or *reading-desk;* where the penitents of the third class, called *the substrators,* kneeled down daily to receive imposition of hands; and to this he thinks the imposition of hands, mentioned in the foresaid canon, chiefly relates, but with this difference, that whereas ordinary penitents received their imposition of hands a little more privately behind the desk, these more notorious and scandalous criminals, which the canon speaks of, received it publicly before the desk in the face and view of all the people. He also is of opinion, that their final absolution was given them in the same place; and that I take to be the true meaning of the imposition of hands in the canon now before us.

Absolution at the altar always given in a supplicatory form by imposition of hands and prayer.

4. However it is certain, whatever the sense of that canon be, that the great and final absolution of public penitents was always performed in a supplicatory form by imposition of hands and prayer. This is evident from the forementioned testimonies of Optatus and St. Jerom[53]. Cyprian speaks often of it, as used both in public and private reconciliation. In one place[54]

[52] In c. eund. (CC. t. 2. p. 1188 e.) Canonis tamen hujus veram hanc sententiam esse censeo, si, unde omnium fidelium exulcerantur animi, quod quidem omnium oculis pateat, peccatum crimenque atrocissimum patratum sit, omnino esse præstandum, ut a quo id admissum est, is præter communem aliorum consuetudinem atque morem, supplicio quodam exquisito, quod pro exemplo sit, pœnas luat: sed ita, ut ne transversum quidem unguem a præscripto cærimoniarum, aut asperitatum, quæ tertio gradu comprehenduntur, in terram sese abjiciat, crebra illa manuum impositione ante absidem purgetur, cæteraque precum ac purgationum genera non negligat; idque non illo protrito, aut usitato, aut aliis tertii gradus pœnitentibus destinato, retro ambonem loco fiat, sed ante absidem: hoc est, in patenti ecclesia, et in loco unde ejusmodi pœnitentes eorumque purgationes ab omnibus conspici possent. Omnibus quidem pœnitentibus tertii gradus manus crebro imponebantur, et purgabantur retro ambonem, qui locus est extra: sed juxta chorum, ut vocant: an vero ante absidem idem sit ac retro ambonem, et hoc canone nihil aliud sibi velint Patres, nisi ut retro ambonem purgentur ejusmodi gravia crimina, (alibi enim, si ita visum fuisset episcopo, poterant purgari) an vero ante absidem, lectoris erit judicium. Quæcumque tandem sit hujusce vocis, *ante absidem,* notio et significatio, certum est hujusce canonis mentem esse, ut eorum gravissimorum criminum pœnitentia et purgatio in omnium oculis constituatur, exemplique cujusdam vim rationemque propositi subeat. Nec video, cur non ea ratione explicandus sit canon ille, omissa illa et posthabita tot dissimilium explicationum mole supervacanea.

[53] S. 2. nn. 46 and 47, preceding.

[54] Ep. 12. [al. 17.] ad Pleb. p. 39. (p. 197.) Nam cum .... pœnitentia agatur justo tempore, et exomologesis fiat, inspecta vita ejus qui agit pœnitentiam; nec ad communicationem venire quis possit, nisi prius

he says, 'all penitents continued a just time in the exercise of penance; they made their confessions, and their life was examined, and then they were received to communion by imposition of hands given them by the bishop and clergy; and there was no other way of being reconciled but this.' He repeats this again in other places[55], and both there and elsewhere complains of some of his presbyters, who transgressed this rule[56], and admitted penitents to the eucharist before this ceremony of admission was regularly performed toward them. He also shows that private reconciliation of penitents upon a death-bed was performed after the same manner[57]: they made their confession before a presbyter or deacon; and, 'if they were in danger of death, imposition of hands was given them, that they might depart hence in peace unto the Lord.' Which shows, that he speaks not only of the intermediate imposition of hands, which was given daily to the third order of penitents called *prostrators*, whilst they were doing their penance, but also of the last imposition of hands, which was given to penitents at their final reconciliation to the communion of the Church. This some canons therefore call *the reconciliatory imposition of hands*, to distinguish it from all other kinds, whether in penance or out of penance.

illi ab episcopo et clero manus fuerit imposita.

[55] Ep. 10. [al. 16.] p. 37. (p. 195.) ...Cum in minoribus peccatis agant peccatores pœnitentiam justo tempore, et secundum disciplinæ ordinem ad exomologesin veniant, et, per manus impositionem episcopi et cleri, jus communicationis accipiant; nunc crudo tempore, persecutione adhuc perseverante, nondum restituta ecclesiæ ipsius pace, ad communicationem admittuntur; et, offertur nomen eorum, et nondum pœnitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illis datur, &c.

[56] De Lapsis. p. 136.—Ep. 12. [al. 17.] p. 39.—Ep. 11. [al. 15.] ad Martyr. p. 34. See s. 1, the third part of n. 42, preceding.

[57] Ep. 13. [al. 18.] p. 40. (p. 197.) ... Si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non exspectata præsentia nostra, apud presbyterum quemcunque præsentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere exitus cœperit, apud diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possunt, ut, manu eis in pœnitentia imposita, veniant ad Dominum cum pace.—Ep. 14. [al. 19.] p. 41. (p. 198.) Satis plene scripsisse me ad hanc rem proximis literis ad vos factis credo, ut qui libellum a martyribus acceperunt, et auxilio eorum adjuvari apud Dominum in delictis suis possunt, si premi infirmitate aliqua et periculo cœperint, exomologesi facta, et manu eis a vobis in pœnitentia imposita, cum pace a martyribus sibi promissa ad Dominum remittantur.—Ep. 15. [al. 20.] p. 43. (p. 200.) Mandavi, ut .... si qui libello a martyribus accepto de sæculo excederent, exomologesi facta, et manu eis in pœnitentia imposita, cum pace sibi a martyribus promissa ad Dominum remitterentur.

The custom continued in Afric to give dying penitents reconciliation in this manner by imposition of hands in the time of St. Austin and the fourth Council of Carthage. For so that Council[58] appointed: 'If a man in sickness desires penance, let him receive it; and, if the signs of death be upon him, let him be reconciled by imposition of hands, and let the eucharist be put into his mouth.' But in other places the eucharist alone was given to dying penitents, as their *viaticum*, when they had not performed their whole penance in health; and if they happened to recover, then they were to finish their penance in their ordinary course; and when they had given evidence of a true repentance by the proper fruits of it, they were then to be received publicly to communion by the reconciliatory imposition of hands, as in this case the first Council of Orange[59] appointed. Now, though there be no mention made of prayer in this way of reconciliation, yet it always is to be understood, according to that of St. Austin[60], who says, 'that imposition of hands is nothing else but prayer;' that is, a ceremony attending all prayers of benediction: which therefore both he[61] and other writers[62] sometimes more expressly call *orationem manus impositionis, the prayer of imposition of hands:* some forms of which, both for penance and other benedictions, may be seen in the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[63]; and

[58] C. 76. (t. 2. p. 1206 a.) ... Accipiat pœnitentiam; et, si continuo creditur moriturus, reconcilietur per manus impositionem, et ori ejus infundatur eucharistia.

[59] C. 3. (t. 3. p. 1448 d.) ... Quod si supervixerint, stent in ordine pœnitentium, ut, ostensis necessariis pœnitentiæ fructibus, legitimam communionem cum reconciliatoria manus impositione recipiant [al. percipiant].—See this canon more fully recited in b. 18. ch. 4. s. 3. p. 148. n. 62.

[60] De Bapt. l. 3. c. 16. (t. 9. p. 117 b.) Quid est enim [nempe, manus impositio] nisi oratio super hominem?

[61] De Peccator. Merit. l. 2. c. 26. (t. 10. p. 62 e.) Non unius modi est sanctificatio: nam et catechumenos secundum quendam modum suum per signum Christi et orationem manus impositionis puto sanctificari.

[62] Clemens Alexandr. Pædagog. l. 3. c. 11. p. 291. (p. 291. 4.) Τίνι γὰρ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐπιτίθησι χεῖρα; τίνα δὲ εὐλογήσει.—Euseb. l. 1. c. 13. (v. 1. p. 40. 21.) Ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς προσελθὼν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ἔπεσεν, εὐχάς τε διὰ χειρὸς λαβὼν ἐθεραπεύθη.—Ibid. l. 7. c. 2. (ibid. p. 322. 23.) Παλαιοῦ γέ τοι κεκρατηκότος ἔθους, ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων μόνῃ χρῆσθαι τῇ διὰ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως εὐχῇ.—Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 395.) Χειροθεσία καὶ εὐχὴ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ.

[63] L. 8. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 395.) Παντοκράτορ Θεὲ αἰώνιε, Δέσποτα τῶν ὅλων, Κτίστα καὶ Πρύτανι τῶν πάντων· ὁ τὸν ἄνθρωπον κόσμου κόσμον ἀναδείξας διὰ Χριστοῦ, καὶ νόμον δοὺς αὐτῷ ἔμφυτον καὶ γραπτὸν, πρὸς τὸ ζῆν αὐτὸν ἐνθέσμως, ὡς λογικόν,

particularly for reconciling of penitents there is an order[64], 'that the bishop shall receive them to communion with imposition of hands, and the prayer of the whole Church for them.'

The form of this prayer is in the end of St. James's Liturgy, under the title of Εὐχὴ τοῦ Ἱλασμοῦ, *The Prayer of Propitiation*[65], which is directed to Christ in these words: 'O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, thou Shepherd and Lamb, that takest away the sins of the world, that forgavest the debt to the two debtors, and grantedst remission of sins to the sinful woman, and gavest to the sick of the palsy both a cure and a pardon of sins; remit, blot out, and pardon our sins, both voluntary and involuntary, whatever we have done wittingly or unwittingly by transgression and disobedience, which thy Spirit knoweth better than we ourselves. And whereinsoever thy

καὶ ἁμαρτόντι ὑποθήκην δοὺς πρὸς μετάνοιαν τὴν σαυτοῦ ἀγαθότητα, ἔπιδε ἐπὶ τοὺς κεκλικότας σοι αὐχένα ψυχῆς, καὶ σώματος· ὅτι οὐ βούλει τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν, ὥστε ἀποστρέψαι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς πονηρᾶς, καὶ ζῆν· Ὁ Νινευιτῶν προσδεξάμενος τὴν μετάνοιαν, ὁ θέλων πάντας ἀνθρώπους σωθῆναι, καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν, ὁ τὸν υἱὸν προσδεξάμενος, τὸν καταφαγόντα τὸν βίον αὐτοῦ ἀσώτως, πατρικοῖς σπλάγχνοις, διὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν, αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν πρόσδεξαι τῶν ἱκετῶν σου τὴν μετάγνωσιν· ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν, ὃς οὐχ ἁμαρτήσεταί σοι. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἁμαρτίας παρατηρήσῃ, Κύριε, Κύριε, τίς ὑποστήσεται; ὅτι παρά σοι ὁ Ἱλασμός ἐστι· καὶ ἀποκατάστησον αὐτοὺς τῇ ἁγίᾳ σου ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἀξίᾳ καὶ τιμῇ, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν· δι' οὗ σοι δόξα καὶ προσκύνησις, ἐν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.—Vid. c. 39. See before, b. 13. ch. 10. s. 8. v. 4. p. 561. n. 31.

[64] Ibid. l. 2. c. 18. (ibid. p. 226.) ... Καὶ προσκλαύσαντα εἰσδέχου, πάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δεομένης, καὶ χειροθετήσας αὐτὸν ἔα λοιπὸν εἶναι ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ.

[65] Missa Jacobi. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 23 e. 5.) Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, Χριστὲ, Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ζῶντος, Ἀμνὲ καὶ Ποιμὴν, ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ τὸ δάνειον τοῖς δυσὶ χρεωφειλέταις χαρισάμενος, καὶ τῇ ἁμαρτωλῷ τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῆς δοὺς, ὁ τὴν ἴασιν τῷ παραλυτικῷ δωρησάμενος, σὺν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ, ἄνες, ἄφες, συγχώρησον ὁ Θεὸς τὰ πλημμελήματα ἡμῶν τὰ ἑκούσια, τὰ ἀκούσια, τὰ ἐν γνώσει, τὰ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ, τὰ ἐν παραβάσει καὶ παρακοῇ γενόμενα, ἃ οἶδε τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ πανάγιον ὑπὲρ τοὺς δούλους σου· καὶ εἴ τι τῶν ἐντολῶν σου, ὡς ἄνθρωποι σάρκα φοροῦντες, καὶ τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον οἰκοῦντες, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐπλανήσθησαν, εἴτε ἐν λόγῳ, ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ· εἴτε ὑπὸ κατάραν ὑπέπεσον, ἢ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀναθέματι, παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι τὴν ἄφατόν σου φιλανθρωπίαν, τῷ μὲν λόγῳ λυθῆναι· συγχωρηθῆναι δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τῷ ὅρκῳ καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀναθέματι κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἀγαθότητα. Καὶ, Δέσποτα Κύριε, εἰσάκουσον τῆς δεήσεώς μου ὑπὲρ τῶν δούλων σου, καὶ πάριδε ὡς ἀμνησίκακος τὰ ἐπταισμένα αὐτῶν ἅπαντα· συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς πᾶν πλημμέλημα ἑκούσιόν τε καὶ ἀκούσιον· ἀπάλλαξον αὐτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου κολάσεως. Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ ἐντειλάμενος ἡμῖν, λέγων, ὅτι, Ὅσα ἂν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· καὶ ὅσα ἂν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Θεὸς τοῦ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν καὶ ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας δυνάμενος· καὶ πρέπει σοι ἡ δόξα σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχῳ Πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ ζωοποιῷ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

bsolution the indicative form, *go te absolvo*, not sed till the relfth entury.

5. If it be inquired, when the use of the indicative form of absolution first began to be used in the Church; that is, the form, *I absolve thee!* instead of the deprecatory form, *Christ absolve thee!* Morinus[70] has fully proved, that there was no use of it till the twelfth or thirteenth century, not long before the time of Thomas Aquinas, [who flourished from about the year 1250 to 1265, and] who was one of the first that wrote in defence of it. And our own learned Bishop Usher[71] has clearly proved the novelty of it from Aquinas himself. For he says[72], 'there was a learned man in his time, who found fault with the indicative form of absolution then used by the priest, *I absolve thee from all thy sins!* and would have it to be delivered only by way of deprecation; alleging, that this was not only the opinion of Gulielmus Antissiodorensis, Gulielmus Parisiensis, and Hugo Cardinalis, [who all flourished about the middle of the thirteenth century;] but also that thirty years were scarce passed, since all did use this form only: *Absolutionem et remissionem tribuat tibi Omnipotens Deus! Almighty God give thee remission and forgiveness!*' This points out the time of the change so precisely, that learned men[73], who allow the form in some sense proper to be used, make no scruple to declare their opinion of the novelty of it upon the strength of the foregoing considerations.

n what ense that orm may e allowed.

6. If it be asked further, in what sense the indicative form of absolution may be allowed? it is answered, that it may be allowed several ways.

1. As *an act of jurisdiction*, by those, who are entrusted with the power of receiving public penitents into communion, and loosing the bonds of excommunication, wherewith they

[70] De Pœnitent. l. 8. cc. 8, 9, &c. (pp. 533, seqq.)

[71] Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 89. (Works, v. 3. p. 133.) Yet in the days of Thomas Aquinas there arose a learned man among the Papists themselves, &c.

[72] Aquin. Opusc. 22. de Forma Absolutionis, c. 5. [Ord. Nov. Opusc. 5. c. 5.] (t. 19. p. 181.) Addit etiam objiciendo, quod vix triginta anni sunt, quando omnes hac sola forma utebantur: *Absolutionem et remissionem, &c.* Sed quomodo de omnibus potest testimonium perhibere, qui omnes non vidit? &c.

[73] See Bp. Fell, Not. in Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 136. (p. 97. n. 1.) Quantumvis nunc temporis formula judiciaria et potestativa, *Ego te absolvo*, quasi tradita a Christo per Apostolos feratur; ex adverso compertissimum habetur, per decem priora sæcula in usu minime receptam: immo nec adhuc in ecclesia Orientali invaluisse. Qua de re videantur quæ diligenter congessit eruditissimus Morinus in Opere de Administrat. Sacrament. Pœnitent. l. 8. cc. 8–12.

were judicially and formally tied by the censure of the Church before. In this sense it is no impropriety for him, who has the key of jurisdiction, and power of relaxing, as well as inflicting Church-censures, to use the indicative form, *I absolve thee!* For this is only an external act of ecclesiastical power, that respects only the outward and visible communion, but does not directly or immediately affect the conscience. Therefore some learned persons[73] not only allow the use of it in this sense, but think it was actually so used by some in the primitive Church. As by Zephyrinus Bishop of Rome, whom Tertullian[74], after he was become a Montanist, upbraids, as saying, 'I forgive the sins of fornication and adultery to those that do penance for them;' meaning, that he admitted them again to the peace and communion of the Church, which the Montanists and the Novatians after them would by no means allow of.

2. This indicative form, *I absolve thee!* may be interpreted to mean no more than the declaration of God's will to a penitent sinner, that upon the best judgment the priest can make of his repentance, he esteems him absolved before God, and accordingly pronounces and declares him absolved: as St. Jerom[75] observes, 'the priests under the Old Law were said to

[73] In Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 136. (ibid.) Notari autem poterit, in omni delicto duo spectanda occurrere. Primo offensam adversus Deum, de qua David Psalm. 51. *In te, in te solum peccavi;* in cujus remedium precibus et resipiscentia unice proficitur, juxta illud D. Petri, Act. 8, 22. ad Simonem Magum, *Pœnitentiam age ab hac nequitia tua, et roga Deum.* Secundo intervenire offensam adversus fratres, de qua D. Paulus, 1 Cor. 8, 12. *Peccantes in fratres, et percutientes conscientiam eorum, &c.* Cui amoliendæ venia ab ecclesia ceu parte læsa, et illius nomine ab episcopo qui eidem præest, omnino expetenda est, juxta illud Apostoli, 2 Cor. 2, 10. *Cui autem aliquid donastis, et ego: nam et ego quod donavi, si quid donavi, propter vos in persona Christi.* Et quidem quantum ad forum exterius, sive offensam adversus fratres, locum fortassis habere poterit illa auctoritativa, quæ in Occidentali ecclesia invaluit, formula, qua et usus fuisse videtur Zephyrinus Tertulliani sæculo: *Ego mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia functis dimitto:* L. de Pud. c. 1. Nec non illa Confessorum, Ep. 40. ad Pam. num. 26., *Scias nos universis, de quibus apud te ratio constiterit, quid post commissum egerint, dedisse pacem:* et Ep. 21. *Universis pacem dimisimus, &c.*—See also Discourse of the Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church, ch. 3. s. 4. By a Presbyter [Nathaniel Marshall], &c. Lond. 1714. (Reprinted at Oxford for the Anglo-Catholic Library, 1844. p. 144.) *Of the Variation of the Form in absolving, &c.*

[74] De Pudicit. c. 1. (p. 555 b.) Pontifex scilicet Maximus, [quod est] episcopus episcoporum, edicit [al. dicit], Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia functis dimitto.

[75] L. 7. in Esai. 23. (t. 4. p. 323 e.) De sacerdotibus in Levitico legimus,

cleanse a leper or pollute him; not that they were the authors of his pollution, but that they declared him to be polluted, who before seemed to many to have been clean.' And in another place[76] he makes a more close remark concerning this matter, whilst he reflects upon 'some bishops and presbyters in his own time, who, not understanding the true meaning of the commission to remit sins, assumed to themselves something of a pharisaical pride and loftiness, so as to imagine they had power either to condemn the innocent, or absolve the guilty: when yet before God it is not the sentence of the priests, but the life of the criminals that is inquired into. We read in Leviticus concerning the lepers, where they are commanded to show themselves to the priests, and if they had the leprosy, they were then to be polluted or made unclean by the priest: not that the priests made them leprous or unclean, but because they had the power of judging who were leprous or not leprous, and might discern who were clean or unclean. As therefore the priest makes the leper clean or unclean, so the bishop or presbyter here binds or looses, not properly making the guilty or the guiltless: but according to the tenour of his office, when he hears the distinction of sins, he knows who is to be bound and who is to be loosed.' Upon this also the Master of the Sentences[77], following St. Jerom, observes, 'that

Contaminatione contaminabit eum ... sacerdos, non quod [al. quo] contaminationis auctor sit, sed quod [al. quo] ostendat eum contaminatum, qui prius mundus plurimis videbatur.

[76] In Matth. 16. t. 9. p. 49. (t. 7. p. 124 e.) Istum locum episcopi et presbyteri non intelligentes, aliquid sibi de Pharisæorum assumunt supercilio, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel solvere se noxios arbitrentur: cum apud Deum non sententia sacerdotum, sed reorum vita quæratur. Legimus in Levitico de leprosis, ubi jubentur, ut ostendant se sacerdotibus, et si lepram habuerint, tunc a sacerdote immundi fiant: non quod [al. quo] sacerdotes leprosos faciant et immundos, sed quod [al. quo] habeant notitiam leprosi et non leprosi, et possint discernere qui mundus, quive immundus sit. Quomodo ergo ibi leprosum sacerdos mundum vel immundum facit, sit et hic alligat vel solvit episcopus et presbyter, non eos, qui insontes sunt vel noxii, [faciens]: sed pro officio suo, cum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, quive solvendus.— I have supplied the word *faciens*, which the sense seems plainly to require. J. B.

[77] Lombard. Sentent. l. 4. distinct. 18. p. 334. (p. 472.) .... Et in remittendis vel in retinendis culpis id juris et officii habent evangelici sacerdotes, quod olim habebant sub lege legales in curandis leprosis. Hi ergo peccata dimittunt vel retinent, dum dimissa a Deo vel retenta indicant et ostendunt. Ponunt etiam sacerdotes nomen Domini super filios Israel; sed ipse benedicit, ut dicit in Numeris, [6, 27].

the priests of the Gospel have that right and office, which the legal priests had of old under the Law in curing the lepers. These therefore forgive sins or retain them, whilst they show and declare that they are forgiven or retained by God. For the priests "put the name of the Lord" upon the children of Israel, but it was he himself that "blessed them," as it is read in the 27th verse of the 6th chapter of Numbers.'

3. The indicative form, *I absolve thee!* may be used in the performance of any external act of the ministry, which is used as a means to obtain remission of sins of God: as in the administration of baptism or the eucharist. The priest may as well say, I absolve thee! as I baptize thee! for baptism is an absolution, as we have seen before: but then the priest's part in it is only to administer the external form; but it is God that gives the internal grace, and spiritually baptizes with remission of sins. Yet forasmuch as the priest has power to minister the external form, he may say, I baptize thee! or, I wash thee with water! which washing is the outward means appointed by God to convey to us remission of sins, and the internal washing of our souls in the blood of Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost. So likewise in the administration of the eucharist a priest might say, I give thee the body of Christ! or, I absolve thee by the body of Christ! meaning, that he ministered to him the outward element of bread, which is the sacramental body of Christ, appointed to be used as a means to convey the real body of Christ and all his benefits, whereof absolution or remission of sins is one, to the worthy receiver. Our Church has not appointed the indicative form of absolution to be used in all these senses, but only once in the office of the sick, and that may reasonably be interpreted, according to the account given out of St. Jerom, a declaration of the sinner's pardon, upon the apparent evidences of a sincere repentance, and the best judgment the minister can make of his condition; beyond which none can go but the Searcher of hearts, to whom alone belongs the infallible and irreversible sentence of absolution. But of this only by the way; I now return to the practice of the primitive Church:

Chrism, or unction, why they were some-

7. Where we may observe, that besides the common way of reconciling ordinary penitents to the Church, there was something often very peculiar in the reconciliation of heretics and

times added to imposition of hands in the reconciliation of certain heretics and schismatics to the Church.

schismatics. For they were considered under a threefold denomination or distinction: either they were such as had been baptized in the Church, and afterward fell away from it: or, secondly, they were such as were baptized in heresy or schism, but with the usual form of baptism: or, thirdly, they were such as had been baptized by heretics or schismatics, by such a corrupted form as destroyed the true nature and essence of the thing itself, and made it altogether a null and void baptism. The first sort were reconciled much after the same manner as other penitents, only making a confession and abjuration of their errors. But the second sort, because they wanted the true effect of baptism, that is, the grace or unction of the Holy Spirit, which they could not have out of the Church in heresy or schism, were therefore reconciled not only with imposition of hands, but with the holy unction or chrism added to it, to give them confirmation, and denote their reception of the Holy Spirit of peace upon their returning to the peace and unity of the Church. And the third sort, because they wanted true baptism, were received after the manner of Heathens, with a new baptism, because their first pretended baptism was altogether null and void. This was the distinction made between those several sorts of heretics, and the true grounds and reasons of the different observations in the Church's discipline in their reconciliation and reception.

The two latter sorts of heretics were scarce looked upon as properly penitents in the Church, but were rather received *sub imagine pœnitentiæ, under the image and resemblance of the penance* that was usually performed by those who had once been members of the Church, as Pope Innocent informs us in one of his Epistles[78]; where, speaking of some who had been baptized by the Arians and other sects who retained the due form of baptism, he says, 'they received them under the

[78] Ep. 18. ad Alexandrum, c. 3. (CC. t. 2. p. 1269 d.) Arianos cæterasque hujusmodi pestes, quia eorum laicos conversos ad Dominum sub imagine pœnitentiæ ac Sancti Spiritus sanctificatione per manus impositionem suscipimus, non videtur, clericos eorum cum sacerdotii aut ministerii cujuspiam suscipi debere dignitate: quoniam quibus solum baptisma ratum esse permittimus, quod utique in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti perficitur, nec Spiritum Sanctum eos habere ex illo baptismate illisque mysteriis arbitramur: quoniam cum a Catholica fide eorum auctores desciscerent, perfectionem Spiritus, quam acceperant, amiserunt, &c.

image of penance with imposition of hands and sanctification of the Holy Spirit, to perfect their baptism, which though given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet wanted the grace of the Holy Spirit, which they could not have but upon their return to the peace and unity of the Catholic Church. Therefore then they received them with imposition of hands, and the unction of chrism, if they had not been anointed before.' This he repeats in several other places[79]. And the same is confirmed by the testimonies of Siricius[80], and Leo[81], and St. Jerom[82], and Gennadius[83], and the author

[79] Ep. 2. ad Victricium, c. 8. (CC. ibid. p. 1251 c.) Ut venientes a Novatianis vel Montensibus, per manus tantum impositionem suscipiantur: quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine sunt baptizati: præter eos, si qui forte a nobis ad illos transeuntes rebaptizati sunt, &c. —Conf. Ep. 22. ad Episc. Macedon. cc. 4, 5. (ibid. p. 1274 b, c.) Ut dicitur, &c.

[80] Ep. 1. ad Himer. Tarracon. c. 1. (CC. ibid. p. 1018 a.) Prima paginæ tuæ fronte signasti, baptizatos ab impiis Arianis, plurimos ad fidem Catholicam festinare, et quosdam de fratribus nostris eosdem denuo baptizare velle, quod non licet: cum hoc fieri et Apostolus vetet, et Canones contradicant, et, post cassatum Ariminense Concilium, missa ad provincias a venerandæ memoriæ prædecessore meo Liberio generalia decreta prohibeant, quos nos cum Novatianis, aliisque hæreticis, sicut est in synodo constitutum, per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, episcopalis manus impositione, Catholicorum conventui sociamus. Quod etiam totus Oriens Occidensque custodit: a quo tramite vos quoque posthac minime convenit deviare, si non vultis a nostro collegio synodali separari sententia.

[81] Ep. 37. ad Leon. Ravennat. c. 2. (CC. t. 3. p. 1316 c.) Quod si ab hæreticis baptizatum quempiam fuisse constiterit, erga hunc nullatenus sacramentum regenerationis iteretur: sed hoc tantum, quod ibi defuit, conferatur, ut per episcopalem manus impositionem virtutem Sancti Spiritus consequatur.—Ep. 92. ad Rustic. Narbon. quæst. 18. (CC. ibid. p. 1408 e.) De his, qui in Africa vel Mauritania venerunt, et nesciunt in qua secta sint baptizati, quid circa eos debeat observari? Resp. Non se isti baptizatos nesciunt, sed cujus fidei fuerint, qui eos baptizaverunt, se nescire profitentur. Unde quolibet modo formam baptismatis acceperint, baptizandi non sunt; sed per manus impositionem, invocata virtute Spiritus Sancti, quam ab hæreticis accipere non potuerunt, Catholicis copulandi sunt.

[82] Dialog. cont. Lucifer. c. 8. [al. c. 24.] (t. 2. p. 198 b.) Numquid dixit [Dominus], Rebaptizentur qui in Nicolaïtarum fide baptizati sunt? vel imponantur eis manus, qui eo tempore apud Pergamenos crediderunt, qui disciplinam tenebant Balaam? Quin potius, *Age*, inquit, *pœnitentiam: &c.*

[83] De Eccles. Dogmat. c. 52. (c. 22. Ed. Bened. int. Oper. Augustin. t. 8. append. p. 78 a, b.) Si qui apud illos hæreticos baptizati sunt, qui in Sanctæ Trinitatis confessione baptizant, et veniunt ad nos, recipiantur quidem ut baptizati, ne Sanctæ Trinitatis invocatio vel confessio annulletur: sed doceantur integre, et instruantur, quo sensu Sanctæ Trinitatis mysterium in ecclesia teneatur: et si consentiunt credere vel acquiescunt confiteri, purgati jam fidei integritate confirmentur manus impositione. Si vero parvuli sunt vel hebetes, qui doctrinam non capiant, respondeant pro illis, qui eos offerunt juxta morem baptizandi: et

under the name of Justin Martyr [84], and the Councils of Orange [85] and Epone [86]: all which, because I have had occasion more fully to represent them in another Work [87], I only just mention in this place, with this single remark, that the Council of Orange, and that of Epone, and the author under the name of Justin, expressly mention the ceremony of *chrism*, or *anointing with holy oil;* which is also appointed by the Council of Laodicea [88], and the general Council of Constantinople [89], and the second Council of Arles [90], and the Council of Trullo [91], to be used with imposition of hands in the reconciliation of such heretics as had been baptized in any heresy or schism with the true form of baptism, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; such are required only to re-

sic manus impositione et chrismate communiti eucharistiæ mysteriis admittantur.—Ibid. de Scriptor. Eccles. c. 27. (int. Oper. Hieron. t. 2. p. 965.) Ursinus monachus scripsit adversus eos, qui rebaptizandos hæreticos decernunt, docens nec legitimum nec Deo dignum rebaptizari illos, qui in nomine simpliciter Christi, vel in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, quamvis pravo sensu, baptizentur: sed, post Trinitatis et Christi simplicem confessionem, sufficere ad salutem manus impositionem Catholici sacerdotis.

[84] Quæst. 14. ad Orthodox. (p. 399 d.) Τοῦ αἱρετικοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἐρχομένου τὸ σφάλμα διορθοῦται, τῆς μὲν κακοδοξίας, τῇ μεταθέσει τοῦ φρονήματος· τοῦ δὲ βαπτίσματος, τῇ ἐπιχρίσει τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου.

[85] C. 1. (t. 3. p. 1447 b.) Hæreticos in mortis discrimine .... cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placet.

[86] C. 16. (t. 4. p. 1578 b.) Hæreticis in lecto decumbentibus [al. Desperatis et decumbentibus hæreticis] ..... chrismate permittimus subvenire.

[87] Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, part 1. ch. 1. ss. 20, 21. [First published in 1712, and now forming the first portion of the ninth volume of this edition of the Author's whole works. Ed.]

[88] C. 7. (t. 1. p. 1497 a.) Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἐκ τῶν αἱρέσεων, τοῦτ' ἔστι, Ναυατιανῶν, ἤτοι Φωτεινιανῶν, ἢ Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατιτῶν, ἐπιστρεφομένους, ἤ τε πιστοὺς τοὺς παρ' ἐκείνους, μὴ προσδέχεσθαι, πρὶν ἀναθεματίσωσι πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ ἐν ᾗ κατείχοντο· καὶ τότε λοιπὸν τοὺς λεγομένους παρ' αὐτοῖς πιστοὺς, ἐκμανθάνοντας τὰ τῆς πίστεως σύμβολα, χρισθέντας τε τῷ ἁγίῳ χρίσματι, οὕτω κοινωνεῖν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ.

[89] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 a.) Ἀρειανοὺς, καὶ Μακεδονιανοὺς, καὶ Σαββατιανοὺς, καὶ Ναυατιανοὺς, τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς Καθαροὺς καὶ Ἀριστεροὺς, καὶ τοὺς Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατίτας, ... δεχόμεθα διδόντας λιβέλλους, καὶ ἀναθεματίζοντας πᾶσαν αἵρεσιν, μὴ φρονοῦσαν ὡς φρονεῖ ἡ ἁγία τοῦ Θεοῦ Καθολικὴ καὶ Ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία· καὶ σφραγιζομένους, ἤ τοι χριομένους πρῶτον τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ τό, τε μέτωπον, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ τὰς ῥῖνας, καὶ τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὰ ὦτα· καὶ σφραγίζοντες αὐτοὺς λέγομεν, Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

[90] C. 17. (t. 4. p. 1013 b.) Bonosiacos ex eodem errore venientes, quos sicut Arianos baptizari in Trinitate manifestum est, si interrogati fidem nostram ex toto corde confessi fuerint, cum chrismate et manus impositione in ecclesia recipi sufficit.

[91] C. 116. (t. 6. p. 1182 d.) A repetition of the words of the seventh canon of the general Council of Constantinople. See n. 89, preceding.

nounce their errors, and learn the true faith, and make profession of it; and then they were to be reconciled with imposition of hands and chrism, which was peculiar to this sort of penitents, who had never before been united truly to the Catholic Church. They seem not to have gone through all the stages of penance, as other penitents did in the Church; but to have been reconciled in a more compendious way, more suitable to their state and condition, as strangers and foreigners now just entering within the pale of the Church. For which reason Pope Innocent styles their short penance 'only an image, or faint resemblance'[92] of that penance, which held other penitents often very long under the discipline of the Church.

Why some heretics could be reconciled no other way, but by a new baptism.

8. As to others, who had been baptized by such heretics as had either wholly rejected or greatly corrupted the true form of baptism, there was a very different way of receiving and reconciling them to the communion of the Church. For they could be admitted no other way but as Heathens, by the door of baptism; seeing their former pretended baptism was not only defective in some remoter circumstances, but in the very form and essence of it, and therefore reputed absolutely null and void, and necessary to be repeated in order to make them members of the Church. Upon this account the Council of Nice[93] ordered the Samosatenians or Paulianists, upon their return to the Catholic Church, to be baptized. The Council of Laodicea[94] made a like order for the reconciliation of the Montanists or Cataphrygians. The first Council of Constantinople[95] decreed the same for the Montanists, Eunomians, and

[92] [Ubi supra. See the first clauses of n. 78, preceding. Ed.]

[93] C. 19. (t. 2. p. 37 d.) *Περὶ τῶν Παυλιανισάντων, εἶτα προσφυγόντων τῇ Καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτέθειται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος.*

[94] C. 8. (t. 1. p. 1497 b.) *Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν λεγομένων Φρυγῶν ἐπιστρέφοντας, εἰ καὶ ἐν κλήρῳ νομιζομένῳ παρ' αὐτοῖς τυγχάνοιεν, εἰ καὶ Μέγιστοι λέγοιντο· τοὺς τοιούτους μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας κατηχεῖσθαί τε καὶ βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ πρεσβυτέρων.*

[95] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 b.) *Εὐνομιανοὺς μέν τοι, τοὺς εἰς μίαν κατάδυσιν βαπτιζομένους, καὶ Μονταναστὰς, τοὺς ἐνταῦθα λεγομένους Φρύγας, καὶ Σαβελλιανοὺς, τοὺς Υἱοπατορίαν διδάσκοντας, καὶ ἕτερά τινα χαλεπὰ ποιοῦντας καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πάσας αἱρέσεις, ἐπειδὴ πολλοί εἰσιν ἐνταῦθα, μάλιστα οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλατῶν χώρας ἐρχόμενοι, πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῶν θέλοντας προστίθεσθαι τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ, ὡς Ἕλληνας δεχόμεθα· καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς Χριστιανοὺς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν κατηχουμένους· εἶτα τὴν τρίτην ἐξορκίζομεν αὐτοὺς μετὰ τοῦ ἐμφυσᾷν τρίτον εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν· καὶ οὕτως κατηχοῦμεν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς χρονίζειν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἀκροᾶσθαι τῶν Γραφῶν· καὶ τότε αὐτοὺς βαπτίζομεν.*

Sabellians. The second Council of Arles[96] adds the Photinians; and the Council of Trullo[97] the Manichees, Valentinians, Marcionites, and all others of the like nature: that is, all such as had not been truly baptized with due form of baptism. There was no other way of reconciling such to the Catholic Church, but by instructing and training them up to the knowledge of the true faith, first as catechumens, and then giving them the absolution of baptism, which in this case was allowed to them, as having never received any true baptism before.

These were the several ways of reconciling penitent heretics according to the variety of their circumstances, and the different state and condition they were in when they desired to be reunited to the body of the Church.

What conditions were required in the reconciliation of those who fell from the Church into heresy or schism.

9. As for those who were baptized in the Church, and afterward fell away into any heresy or schism, we find no other way of reconciling them but the common and ordinary way of reconciling all other penitents, by imposition of hands and prayer. For, as I have noted before, [at the beginning of the second section of the first chapter of this Book,] if the first baptism was valid, a second baptism was never allowed to be given to any penitent by way of absolution. Yet some greater hardships and severer conditions were often imposed upon such apostates and deserters before they could be admitted to the peace of the Church again. If they were ringleaders and broachers of the heresy, who drew others into their error and faction, it was commonly required that they should bring back the multitude whom they had deceived, before they obtained a perfect absolution. Thus Tertullian[98] observes of Marcion, that he was promised to be absolved only upon this condition, that he should reduce those back again to the Church whom

[96] C. 16. (t. 4. p. 1013 b.) Photinianos, sive Paulianistas, secundum patrum statuta baptizari oportet.

[97] C. 96. (t. 6. p. 1183 a.) The canon first employs the same words as those of c. 7. of C. Constantinop. 1., cited before at n. 89, preceding, and then continues,—*Καὶ τοὺς Μανιχαίους δὲ, καὶ τοὺς Οὐαλεντίους, καὶ Μαρκιωνιστὰς, καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων χρὴ ποιεῖν λιβέλλους, καὶ ἀναθεματίζειν τὴν αἵρεσιν, καὶ Νεστόριον, καὶ Εὐτυχέα, καὶ Διόσκορον, καὶ Σεβῆρον, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐξάρχους τῶν τοιούτων αἱρέσεων, καὶ τοὺς φρονοῦντας τὰ αὐτῶν, καὶ πάσας τὰς προαναφερομένας αἱρέσεις· καὶ οὕτω μεταλαμβάνειν τῆς ἁγίας κοινωνίας.*

[98] De Præscript. c. 30. (p. 212 c.) ... Ita pacem recepturus, si cæteros [quoque,] quos perditioni erudisset, ecclesiæ restitueret, morte præventus est.

he had led away by his doctrine into perdition: and he undertook to do this, but death prevented him. Cyprian makes a like remark in the case of Trophimus, one of the three bishops who were concerned in giving Novatian an unlawful ordination, whereby they set him up as anti-bishop against Cornelius, and raised a flaming schism in Rome: he says[99], 'his supplication for re-admission was accepted, because by his humility and satisfaction he brought back the people whom he had drawn into the schism; and it was not so much Trophimus that was admitted again into the Church, as a great number of the brethren who had gone aside with him, and would not have returned without their leader:' and yet he was not allowed to retain his episcopal office, but only to communicate in the quality of a layman.

Sometimes it was required of them as a condition of their absolution, that they should make discovery of the remainders of their faction. St. Austin gives us an instance of this in his own treatment of one Victorinus a subdeacon, who fled over to the sect of the Manichees: when he returned again, and desired to find a place for repentance, St. Austin[1] refused to admit him, unless he would give information of the rest of his party. Sometimes they were required to anathematize their errors, and abjure them in writing. The Council of Nice[2] exacted this condition of the Novatians; and the Council of Gangra[3], of the Eustathians; and the second Council of Arles[4], of the Novatians; and the African Councils[5], of the Donatists. The

[99] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 105. (p. 244.) .... Fraternitatem, quam nuper abstraxerat cum plena humilitate et satisfactione revocante [Trophimo] auditæ sunt ejus preces; et in ecclesiam Domini non tam Trophimus, quam maximus fratrum numerus, qui cum Trophimo fuerat, admissus est; qui omnes regressuri ad ecclesiam non essent, nisi cum Trophimo, comitante venissent .... sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicus communicet, non quasi ..... locum sacerdotis usurpet.

[1] [Ep. 74. [al. 236.] (t. 2. p. 849. c. 7.) Petenti autem pœnitentiæ locum tunc credatur, si et alios quos illic [inter Manichæos] novit esse, manifestaverit vobis non solum in Malliana, sed in ipsa tota omnino provincia. Ed.]

[2] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 32 e.) .... Πρὸ πάντων δὲ τοῦτο ὁμολογῆσαι αὐτοὺς ἐγγράφως προσήκει, κ. τ. λ.

[3] In Proœm. (ibid. p. 416 b.) Εἰ δὲ μεταγνοῖεν, καὶ ἀναθεματίζοιεν ἕκαστον τούτων τῶν κακῶς λεχθέντων, δεκτοὺς αὐτοὺς γίνεσθαι.

[4] C. 9. (t. 4. p. 1012 b.) Novatianum in communionem recipi non debere, nisi suscepta pœnitentiæ credulitate præteritum damnet errorem.

[5] Cod. Afric. c. 57. (t. 2. p. 1083 d.) .... Ἀναθεματιζομένου τοῦ τῆς

Council of Laodicea[6] insists upon the same from the Novatians, Photinians, and Quartadecimans. And the general Council of Constantinople[7] exacts it of the Macedonians, Sabbatians, Arians, Novatians, Quartadecimans. And sometimes they were required not only to anathematize error, and subscribe the truth, but to take an oath for greater confirmation: as Socrates[8] says, Constantine obliged Arius to do, though he did it fraudulently and like an impostor. This was the precaution which the Church used particularly in the case of heretical apostates, to be ascertained of their sincerity in making recantations before she would receive them into her communion again, or grant them absolution.

Of the time of absolution.

10. There is one circumstance more to be noted under this head, which is the ordinary time of absolution: this seems to have been fixed in the ordinary course of discipline to the day of our Saviour's passion, or rather the day on which he was betrayed. For so St. Ambrose[9] says expressly, 'that on the day that our Lord gave himself for us, it was usual in the Church to relax men's penance, or grant them absolution.' In the Roman Church, in the time of Pope Innocent[10] the custom was the same, to absolve penitents only upon Thursday before Easter, except some sickness intervened, and the penitent's life was despaired of: for then he might be reconciled at any time, when necessity required, rather than leave the world without the benefit of communion. It was at or about this time also, that the emperors, perhaps in imitation of this custom of the Church, were wont to send forth their civil absolu-

πλάνης ὀνόματος, διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῆς χειρὸς ἀναδεχθῶσιν εἰς τὴν μίαν ἐκκλησίαν, κ. τ. λ.

6 C. 7. See n. 88, preceding.

7 C. 7. See n. 89, preceding.

8 L. 1. c. 38. (v. 2. p. 74. 9.) Ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀπόπειραν Ἀρείου ποιήσασθαι βουληθεὶς, ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια αὐτὸν μεταπέμπεται, ἠρώτα τε, εἰ τοῖς ὅροις στοιχεῖ τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου· ὁ δὲ ἑτοίμως μηδὲν μελλήσας, ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ὑπέγραφε τὰ περὶ τῆς πίστεως ὁρισθέντα σοφισάμενος· καὶ ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς θαυμάσας, καὶ ὅρκον ἐπέφερεν· ὁ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο σοφιζόμενος ἐποίει.

9 Ep. 33. [al. 20.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 159 b. n. 26.) Erat dies, quo Dominus sese pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia pœnitentia relaxatur.

10 Ep. 1. ad Decent. c. 7. (CC. t. 2. p. 1247 d.) Pœnitentibus.... si nulla interveniat ægritudo, quinta feria ante Pascha remittendum Romanæ ecclesiæ consuetudo demonstrat, &c.—Vid. Hieron. Ep. 30. [al. 77.] Epitaph. Fabiol. (t. 1. p. 455. d. n. 4.) Quis hoc crederet.... ut errorem publice fateretur; et, tota urbe spectante Romana, ante diem Paschæ, ... staret in ordine pœnitentium, etc.

tions or indulgences, as they called them, whereby at the Paschal festival they granted pardon to all criminals who lay bound in prison for their faults, except some that were of a more malignant and unpardonable nature. This practice was first begun by Valentinian, and continued by Theodosius and the succeeding emperors; of which there is a whole title in the Theodosian Code [11], to mention no other writers at present that speak of it. The monks who petitioned in behalf of Eutyches in the second Council of Ephesus [12], plainly refer to both customs, the sacred and the civil. For upon this day, say they, meaning the Paschal solemnity, the holy fathers relax the punishment of many offenders: and the emperors loose the bonds of those that are in chains for their transgressions. So that this was the chief time of discharging both civil and ecclesiastical criminals, and in regard to each of them the discharge was styled, (according to the nature of the thing, either in a civil or ecclesiastical sense,) *an absolution* or *indulgence.*

How the church absolved some penitents, or received them into communion after death.

11. We have hitherto considered the manner and circumstances of absolution, as given to all sorts of penitents whilst they were living. But besides this we are to take notice of another way of absolving penitents, and receiving men into communion even after death. For it sometimes happened that true penitents and very good men, by accident, died under the censure of excommunication unrelaxed, and so out of the external visible communion of the Church. Which might happen in two cases. First, when penitents chanced to die suddenly, whilst they were diligently performing their penance; or were in a journey, or at sea, where they had no minister to give them a formal reconciliation or absolution. Secondly, when innocent men were overborne by some great and prevalent faction, and unjustly excommunicated, and never received into the external communion of the Church by reason of the

[11] L. 9. tit. 38. de Indulgentiis Criminum, leg. 3, 4. &c. (t. 3. pp. 271, seqq.) Ob diem Paschæ, &c.

[12] Act. Synod. Ephes. in Act. 1. C. Chalced. (t. 4. p. 248 c.) Ἐπέστη καὶ ἡ τοῦ Σωτηρίου πάθους ἡμέρα, καὶ νὺξ ἱερὰ, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἑορτὴ, καθ' ἣν λύεται μὲν τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐπιτίμια, λύεται δὲ παρὰ τῶν βασιλευόντων ἐπὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων τὰ δεσμὰ τοῖς ὑπευθύνοις, κ. τ. λ.—See another such instance out of the Council of Berytus, Act. 10. (ibid. 642 a.) Ὁ ἀρχιεπίσκοπος διὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοὺς τῆς ἀκοινωνησίας ἐπὶ τῷ ὅρῳ τούτῳ, ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ ἐξελθεῖν Ἀντιόχειαν, κ. τ. λ.

power that prevailed against them. For both these cases the Church provided a remedy by using some ceremony to admit them into communion, or rather to acknowledge them to be in communion after death.

For penitents, who died suddenly whilst they were carefully doing their penance, it was provided, that notwithstanding this accident, they should be treated as persons dying in the communion of the Church, though they wanted a formal reconciliation. To this purpose the fourth Council of Carthage made a decree [13], 'that if any penitents, who were diligently observing the rules of penance, happened to die by any sudden accident, whilst they were on a journey or at sea, where no assistance could be given them, their memorials notwithstanding should be recommended both in the prayers and the oblations of the Church.' And the second Council of Vaison has an order [14] of the same nature, which is a little more particular: 'If any of those who have submitted to the laws of penance, and in pursuance thereof lead a good life in all satisfactory compunction, shall happen to be prevented by sudden death in the country or in a journey, their oblations shall be received, and their funeral obsequies and memorials be performed after the manner and custom of the Church: because it were unreasonable to exclude the commemorations of those out of the sacred service, to which service they were labouring with all diligence and fidelity to attain; and to whom the bishop, (though they chanced to be intercepted from receiving the *viaticum* of the eucharist,) would perhaps not have thought it improper to have granted the most perfect reconciliation.' The practice of the Roman Church indeed was otherwise in the time of Pope Leo, as appears from some of his Epistles [15]: but

[13] C. 79. (t. 2. p. 1206 b.) Pœnitentes, qui attente leges pœnitentiæ exequuntur, si casu in itinere vel in mari mortui fuerint, ubi eis subveniri non possit, memoria eorum et orationibus et oblationibus commendetur.

[14] C. 2. (t. 3. p. 1457 b.) Pro his, qui, pœnitentia accepta, in bonæ vitæ cursu satisfactoria compunctione viventes, sine communione inopinato nonnunquam transitu in agris aut itineribus præveniantur, oblationem recipiendam, et eorum funera ac deinceps memoriam ecclesiastico affectu prosequendam: quia nefas est eorum commemorationes excludi a salutaribus sacris, qui ad eadem sacra fideli affectu contendentes.... absque sacramentorum viatico intercipiuntur, quibus fortasse nec sacerdos absolutissimam reconciliationem denegandam putasset.

[15] Ep. 90. al. 92. ad Rusticum, c. 6. (CC. [c. 8.] ibid. p. 1407 b.) De his, qui animo jam deficientes

their practice was almost singular: for the general current was against them, inclining to the more favourable side in behalf of such penitents as died suddenly without reconciliation. Which is observed by the fathers in the eleventh Council of Toledo[16], who thereupon determine, 'that though there were different rules about this matter, yet it was more proper to follow the majority, which decreed on the favourable side in behalf of such penitents, that their memorial should be recommended in the Church, and that the presbyters should receive their oblations.'

As to the other sort of persons who were unjustly excommunicated by the power of some prevailing faction, the way of restoring them to the external communion of the Church after death, was by inserting their names into the diptychs of the Church, (as Theodoret[17] tells us it was done by Atticus in the case of Chrysostom,) which was enough to restore them after death to the communion and fellowship of the faithful. And so I have done with the circumstances and ceremonies observed in the ancient manner of absolution.

pœnitentiam accipiunt, et ante communionem moriuntur. *Responsio.* Horum causa Dei judicio reservanda est, in cujus manu fuit, ut talium obitus usque ad communionis remedium differretur. Nos autem quibus viventibus non communicavimus, mortuis communicare non possumus.—Ep. 89. ad Theodor. (CC. ibid. p. 1403 b.) Si aliquis eorum, pro quibus Domino supplicamus, quocunque interceptus obstaculo, a munere indulgentiæ præsentis exciderit, et priusquam ad constituta remedia perveniat, temporalem vitam humana conditione finierit; quod manens in corpore non receperit, consequi exutus carne non poterit.

[16] C. 12. (t. 6. p. 553 b.) De his autem, qui, accepta pœnitentia, antequam reconciliarentur, ab hac vita recesserint; quanquam diversitas præceptorum de hoc capitulo habeatur; illorum tamen nobis sententia placuit, qui multiplici numero de hujusmodi humanius decreverunt, ut et memoria talium in ecclesiis commendetur, et oblatio pro eorum delicto a presbyteris recipiatur.

[17] L. 5. c. 34. (v. 3. p. 234. 40.) *Τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου διδασκάλου τῆς οἰκουμένης, οὗ πρότερον οἱ τῆς ἑσπέρας ἐπίσκοποι τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τῇ Ἑῴᾳ, καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Βοσπόρῳ καὶ τῇ Θράκῃ, τὴν κοινωνίαν ἠσπάσαντο, ἕως ἐκείνου τοῦ θεσπεσίου ἀνδρὸς τοὔνομα τοῖς τεθνεῶσιν ἐπισκόποις συνέταξαν. Καὶ Ἀρσάκιον μὲν, ὃς μετ' ἐκεῖνον ἐγένετο, προσρήσεως οὐκ ἠξίωσαν· Ἀττικὸν δὲ, τὸν Ἀρσακίου διάδοχον, πολλάκις μὲν πρεσβευσάμενον, πολλάκις δὲ τῆς εἰρήνης τυχεῖν ἀξιώσαντα, χρόνῳ ὕστερον ἐδέξαντο τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐγγράψαντα.* —See C. Constantinop. sub Menna. Act. 5. (t. 5. pp. 98 seqq.) in the case of Leo, Euphemius, and others,

CHAP. III.

Of the minister of ecclesiastical discipline, and particularly of the minister of absolution.

All the power of discipline primarily lodged in the hands of the bishop.

1. THERE remains but one thing more to be examined in this matter, relating to the exercise of discipline in the practice of the Church; and that is, By what hands it was managed? who ordinarily had the power of the spiritual sword? and who particularly was the proper minister of absolution?

That all the power of discipline was primarily lodged in the hands of the bishop, as all other offices of the Church, is a matter uncontested, and evident from the whole foregoing history and account of the practice of the Church. For the canons always speak of the bishop, at least in conjunction with his ecclesiastical senate, his presbytery, as cutting off offenders from the Church, and imposing penance upon them; and then again examining their proficiency, and either lengthening their penance, or moderating it by his indulgence; and finally admitting them to the communion of the Church by absolution.

This in many cases committed to presbyters either by a general or particular commission.

2. And this, so far as the bishop could manage it, might be retained solely to himself, and exercised at his own discretion. But because the necessities of the Church required in many cases, that part of this burden should devolve upon others, and the bishop was not able personally to discharge the whole of it to all that needed: therefore presbyters, as his proper assistants, were taken in to be sharers and fellow-labourers with him. They had a general commission to grant the great indulgence or absolution of baptism, and that of the eucharist, and the word and doctrine to all that needed: and though they were more restrained in the exercise of public discipline, and the final reconciliation of public penitents by imposition of hands and prayer; yet the intermediate imposition of hands upon the penitents in their daily exercise was often committed to them: and by the bishop's leave they might give the final reconciliation to public penitents, either openly in the church, or privately on a sick bed, when necessity and the fear of imminent death required a speedier absolution. This is evident from the very canons, which restrain the power of presbyters in reconciling public penitents, and reserve it solely to the bishop; they still admit of these limitations and exceptions.

The second Council of Carthage has two canons, which thus divide the matter between them. The first[18] says, 'a presbyter shall not reconcile any penitent in the public service:' but the other[19] immediately adds, 'that if any one be in danger of death, and desires to be reconciled to the altar, if the bishop be absent, the presbyter shall consult the bishop, and so reconcile him at his command.' And so the third Council of Carthage[20] determined, 'that a presbyter should not reconcile a penitent without consulting the bishop, unless the bishop was absent and necessity compelled him.' The Council of Orange made a like decree[21] about reconciling such penitents as had been baptized by heretics, 'that in case they were in danger of death, and desired to be made Catholics, if the bishop was absent, a presbyter should consign them with chrism and the benediction.' And the Council of Epone has a like order[22], 'that if any heretics who lay desperately sick upon their beds, desired suddenly to be converted, in that case, for the salvation of their souls, which was heartily desired, a presbyter should be permitted to give them the consolation of chrism, that is, both confirmation and reconciliation, which those that were in health were only to desire of the bishop.' And that this was the ancient rule of the Church, appears from the Letters of Dionysius[23], bishop of Alexandria, in Eusebius, where he says, 'he had given orders to his presbyters to grant absolution to all that were on the point of death, if they desired it; and especially if they had desired it before, that they might have

[18] C. 3. (t. 2. p. 1160 b.) Reconciliare quenquam in publica missa, presbytero non licere, hoc omnibus placet.

[19] C. 4. (ibid. b.) Si quisquam in periculo fuerit constitutus, et se reconciliari divinis altaribus petierit, si episcopus absens fuerit, debet utique presbyter consulere episcopum, et sic periclitantem ejus præcepto reconciliare.

[20] C. 32. (ibid. p. 1171 e.) Ut presbyter inconsulto episcopo non reconciliet pœnitentem, nisi absente episcopo, et necessitate cogente.

[21] C. 2. (t. 3. p. 1447 b.) Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderent, si desit episcopus, a presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placet [al. placuit].

[22] C. 16. (t. 4. p. 1578 b.) Presbytero, propter salutem animarum, quam in cunctis optamus desperatis, et [in lecto] decumbentibus hæreticis, si conversionem subitam petant, chrismate permittimus subvenire. Quod etiam omnes conversuri, si sani sunt, ab episcopo noverint expetendum.

[23] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 44. (v. 1. p. 317. 9.).. *Ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ δεδομένης, τοὺς ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι, ἵν' εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται.*

hope and consolation in their last minutes, when they were about to leave the world.'

And to deacons also.

3. Neither was this commission and license granted only to presbyters, but to deacons also. For as they were allowed to give men the absolution of baptism in cases of extreme necessity, so they were authorized to grant penitents the reconciliatory absolution in the same circumstances likewise. For so the Council of Eliberis[24] seems to determine, that though presbyters ordinarily had not power to admit any one to penance, but only the bishop: yet in case of infirmity both presbyters and deacons ought to receive penitents to the communion, having the bishop's command to do it. This is more plainly delivered by Cyprian[25], who says, 'If penitents were seized with any calamity, and were in apparent danger of death, in the absence of the bishop, they might make their confession before any presbyter that was present; or, if a presbyter could not be found, before a deacon, and receive imposition of hands, that they might go to the Lord in peace.' It is plain also that the clergy had some share with the bishop in the more public and solemn absolutions: because Cyprian often[26] complains of some forward men, who were desirous of having the eucharist granted them before they had received the solemn imposition of hands from the bishop and the clergy to reconcile them to the altar.

[24] C. 32. (t. 1. p. 974 b.) Apud presbyterum, si quis gravi lapsu in ruinam mortis inciderit, placuit agere pœnitentiam non debere, sed potius apud episcopum; cogente tamen infirmitate, necesse est presbyterum communionem præstare debere, et diaconum, si ei jusserit sacerdos.

[25] Ep. 13. [al. 18.] p. 40. (p. 197.) Si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectata præsentia nostra, apud presbyterum quemcunque præsentem, vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, ut urgere exitus cœperit, apud diaconum quoque exomologesin facere delicti sui possint; ut, manu eis in pœnitentia imposita, veniant ad Dominum cum pace.—Vid. Ep. 14. [al. 19.] p. 41. (p. 198.) Quoniam tamen significastis quosdam immoderatos esse, et communicationem accipiendam festinanter urgere; et desiderastis in hac re formam a me vobis dari; satis plene scripsisse me ad hanc rem proximis literis ad vos factis credo, ut,.... si premi infirmitate aliqua et periculo cœperint, exomologesi facta, et manu eis a vobis in pœnitentia imposita, cum pace a martyribus sibi promissa, ad Dominum remittantur.

[26] Ep. 10. [al. 16.] p. 37. (p. 195.) ... Nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illis datur, &c.—Ep. 11. [al. 15.] p. 34. (p. 193.)... Ante manum ab episcopo et clero in pœnitentiam impositam, &c.—Ep. 12. [al. 17.] p. 39. (p. 197.) ... Nec ad communicationem venire quis possit, nisi prius illi ab episcopo et clero manus fuerit imposita, &c.

4. But as presbyters and deacons did nothing alone in this matter without the bishop, but either in conjunction with him, or by his authority and permission: so much less was this power intrusted in the hands of any layman. Only in case of extreme necessity, some canons allowed a layman to give baptism to a catechumen, which was reputed, as we have heard before[26], one sort of absolution, rather than he should die unbaptized. This is evident from the decree made in the Council of Eliberis[27], 'that in a voyage at sea, or in any place where there was no church near at hand, if a catechumen happened to be extremely sick, and at the point of death, any Christian, who had his own baptism entire, and was no bigamist, might baptize him.' And the sentiments of Tertullian, St. Jerom, and St. Austin, with several others that have been canvassed in another Book[28], show that this was not the singular opinion of that Council. As to the other sacrament, we nowhere find that either deacons or laymen were allowed to consecrate it; that being the office of presbyters only. Neither were laymen allowed to minister publicly either the bread or the cup, when consecrated, to the people: for that was the standing office of deacons. Yet a layman in case of absolute necessity might carry and minister the consecrated bread and wine in private to a dying person, and so far be instrumental in his absolution: as appears from that famous case related by Eusebius[29], out of Dionysius of Alexandria, concerning Serapion, who had the eucharist sent him by the priest, and given him by the hands of his servant.

How far, and in wha sense abso lution might be said to be given by a layman.

But the remark which Bishop Fell[30] makes upon this is very just: 'that whatever necessity compels men to do, it defends, but only so far and so long as the necessity lasts. It is a known story in Eusebius, of the eucharist being

[26] Ch. 1. s. 2. p. 174. and b. 11. ch. 1. s. 2. v. 4. p. 2.

[27] C. 38. (t. 1. p. 974 e.) Peregre navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum: &c.

[28] Scholast. History of Lay-Bapt. part 1. ch. 1. s. 8, &c.—See before, ch. 2. s. 7. p. 204. n. 87.

[29] L. 6. c. 44. See before, ch. 1. s. 3. p. 180. n. 24, where the whole story is more fully related.

[30] Not. in Cypr. Ep. 18. p. 40. Quæcunque necessitas cogit, etiam illa defendit. Nota est historia apud Eusebium, l. 6. c. 44., eucharistiæ per puerum Serapioni transmissæ: nemo tamen dixerit, fas esse pueris sacra illa mysteria distribuere.

transmitted to Serapion by a boy[30]: yet no one may thence infer that therefore children may dispense those holy mysteries.' He thinks the same reason holds for deacons reconciling penitents in case of extreme necessity: that it was an extraordinary case; and no consequence is to be drawn from necessity and extraordinary cases, to prejudice the ordinary rules and standing measures of the Church. If men exceed their commission, and excommunicate or absolve without power, they are themselves liable to censure for their usurpation, and the Church may reverse all such irregular acts by her own just authority at pleasure. Therefore when the Council of Ephesus had deposed Nestorius and Cœlestius for their heresy, and reduced them to the state of laymen, she declared[31] 'that she took from them all the power of the priesthood, which enabled them to do good or harm to others,' that is, either to excommunicate or absolve. And whereas Nestorius after this pretended to depose some clerks from their priestly office for their orthodoxy, the Synod declared his act a nullity[32], and that the priests so deposed should be restored to their station again. And on the other hand, whereas Nestorius and his accomplices had attempted to restore those to communion, or their order, whom the Synod had condemned, the Synod declared[33] this should not profit them; they should remain excommunicate or deposed notwithstanding. This shows, that neither laymen, nor clerks reduced to the state of laymen, had any power of binding or loosing by the ordinary rules of discipline in the Church. And so, Theodoret[34] says, a certain

[30] See before, ch. 1. s. 3. p. 180. n. 24.

[31] Ep. Encyclic. (t. 3. p. 803 b.).. *Οὕς τινας δόγματι κοινῷ ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος πάσης μὲν ἐκκλησιαστικῆς κοινωνίας ἀλλοτρίους ἐποίησε, πᾶσαν δὲ αὐτῶν ἐνέργειαν ἱερατικὴν περιεῖλε, δι' ἧς ἠδύναντο βλάπτειν ἢ ὠφελεῖν τινάς.*

[32] C. 3. (ibid. p. 806 a.) *Εἰ δέ τινες καὶ τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ἢ χώρᾳ κληρικῶν ὑπὸ Νεστορίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντων τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐκωλύθησαν διὰ τὸ ὀρθῶς φρονεῖν, ἐδικαιώσαμεν καὶ τούτους τὸν ἴδιον ἀπολαβεῖν βαθμόν.*

[33] C. 5. (ibid. c.) *Ὅσοι δὲ ἐπὶ ἀτόποις πράξεσι κατεκρίθησαν ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας συνόδου, ἢ ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπισκόπων, καὶ τούτους ἀκανονίστως κατὰ τὴν ἐν ἅπασιν ἀδιαφορίαν αὐτοῦ ὁ Νεστόριος, καὶ οἱ τὰ αὐτοῦ φρονοῦντες ἀποδοῦναι ἐπειράθησαν ἢ πειραθεῖεν κοινωνίαν, ἢ βαθμὸν, ἀνωφελήτους εἶναι, καὶ μένειν καὶ τούτους, καὶ εἶναι οὐδὲν ἧττον καθῃρημένους ἐδικαιώσαμεν.*

[34] L. 5. c. 37. (v. 3. p. 236. 35.) *Ἀνήρ τις ἀσκητικὸν μὲν ἀσπαζόμενος βίον, θρασυτέρᾳ δὲ χρώμενος γνώμῃ, προσελήλυθε τῷ βασιλεῖ περί τινος δεόμενος. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦτο δράσας πολλάκις οὐκ ἔτυχε, τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς αὐτὸν κοινωνίας ἐκώλυσε, καὶ τὸν*

bishop told Theodosius Junior, when he was under some concern for being rashly excommunicated by a monk. The good emperor was uneasy even under an unjust excommunication by an incompetent authority pronounced against him, and would not sit down to meat till he was absolved. For which purpose he sent to the bishop, to desire him to engage the person who had bound him to come and absolve him; the bishop told him, it did not belong to every one to excommunicate, and therefore he was absolved already: yet this did not satisfy the emperor, till the man was found out, to come himself, and restore him to the communion of the Church. The bishop's answer in this case was certainly very just; but the emperor, being a man of a tender conscience, could not entirely rest upon it. Perhaps he was sensible he had done the monk some personal injury, in which case personal satisfaction was to be made, and private pardon to be asked, according to that rule of our Saviour, [Matth. 5, 23 and 24.] "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." In this case every man has power to pardon the sins of his brother, and also to admonish him, and instruct him, and pray for him, which are private and remote ways of reconciling him to the altar: it is of these St. Austin[35] speaks in conformity to that precept of the Apostle, Col. 3, 13. "Forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye." 'Let us forgive one another's sins,' says he, 'and pray for the sins of each other, and so in some measure wash one

δεσμὸν ἐπιθεὶς, ὑπεχώρησεν. Ὁ δὲ πιστότατος βασιλεὺς, παραγενόμενος εἰς τὰ βασίλεια, καὶ τοῦ καιροῦ καλοῦντος εἰς εὐωχίαν, καὶ τῶν συσσίτων παρόντων, οὐκ ἔφη πρὶν λυθῆναι τὸν δεσμὸν μετασχεῖν τροφῆς· καὶ τούτου δὴ ἕνεκα πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα τὸν οἰκειότατον ἔπεμψε, παρακαλῶν ἐπιτρέψαι τῷ δεδωκότι τὸν δεσμὸν διαλῦσαι· τοῦ δὲ ἐπισκόπου φήσαντος μὴ χρῆναι παρὰ παντὸς ὁτιοῦν δέχεσθαι τὸν δεσμὸν καὶ δεδηλωκότος ὡς λέλυται, οὐκ ἐδέξατο τὴν λῦσιν, ἕως ὁ δήσας, σὺν πολλῷ τῷ πόνῳ ζητηθεὶς, τὴν κοινωνίαν ἀπέδωκεν.

[35] Tractat. 58. in Ioan. t. 9. p. 164. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 481 e.) Invicem nobis delicta donemus, et pro nostris delictis invicem oremus, atque ita quodammodo pedes nostros lavemur. Nostrum est, donante ipso, ministerium caritatis et humilitatis adhibere: illius est exaudire, ac nos ab omni peccatorum contaminatione mundare per Christum, et in Christo, ut quod aliis etiam dimittimus, hoc est in terra solvimus, solvatur in cœlo.

another's feet. It is our part, by the gift of God, to use the ministry of charity and humility; but it belongs to God to hear our prayers, and cleanse us from all pollution of sins by Christ and in Christ, that what we forgive unto others, that is to say, what we loose upon earth, may be loosed in heaven.' This is so necessary a part of Christian duty, that no one may forego this way of loosing his brother, under pain of having his own sins retained by God. "For if we forgive men their trespasses, our heavenly Father will also forgive us: but if we forgive not men their trespasses, neither will our Father forgive our trespasses." [Matth. 6, 14, 15.] Upon which one of the Ancients[36] observes, 'that we bind ourselves the faster in our own sins, if we refuse to loose the bonds of others.' And nothing is more common among the Fathers than to say, 'men bind themselves, or are bound by others, when they trespass against them, and never ask forgiveness:' and 'that they loose themselves or others from sin, either by almsdeeds, or charity, or converting of sinners, or praying for them, or remitting their trespasses committed against them.'

With respect to binding, St. Austin[37] says, 'When any brother sins against another, and he thereupon begins to esteem him as a publican, he binds him on earth; but he must take care that he bind him justly, for unjust bonds are broken by the justice of God.' And for loosing, Origen reckons up seven ways[38], whereby Christians may obtain remission of

[36] Sedulius, Carm. Paschal. l. 2. ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 8. p. 665. (ap. Galland. t. 9. p. 545 d.)

Debita laxari qui nobis cuncta rogamus,
Nos quoque laxemus: proprii nam cautio verbi
Spondentes manifesta tenet; graviusque soluti
Nectimur, alterius si solvere vincla negemus.
Incipietque pius, decies millena talenta
Dimittens, Dominus, si nos affligere propter
Denarios centum conservum senserit ullum,
Tradere confestim tortoribus: &c.

[37] Serm. 16. de Verb. Dom. [al. Serm. 82.] c. 4. (t. 5. p. 442 g.) Cœpisti habere fratrem tuum tanquam publicanum: ligas illum in terra. Sed ut juste alliges, vide: nam injusta vincula dirumpit justitia.

[38] Hom. 2. in Levit. t. 1. p. 111. (t. 2. p. 190 d.) Audisti quanta sint in lege sacrificia pro peccatis: audi nunc, quantæ sint remissiones peccatorum in Evangeliis. Est ista prima, qua baptizamur in remissionem peccatorum. Secunda remissio est in passione martyrii. Tertia est, quæ pro eleemosyna datur: dicit

sins, whereof five are apparently private actions of private men: 'The first is baptism, whereby men are baptized for the remission of sins. The second is the suffering of martyrdom. The third is almsdeeds: for our Saviour says, "Give alms, and behold all things are clean unto you." The fourth is forgiving the sins of our brethren: for our Lord and Saviour says, "If ye from your heart forgive your brethren their trespasses, your Father will forgive your trespasses." The fifth is, when one converts a sinner from the error of his ways. The sixth is the abundance of charity, as our Lord says, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, because she loved much." The seventh is the hard and laborious way by penance, when a man waters his couch with his tears, and his tears are his bread day and night, and he is not ashamed to declare his sin to the priest of the Lord, and seek a cure.' The first and last of these, viz. baptism and penance, are public acts, in which the ministry of the priest is concerned: but all the rest, martyrdom, almsdeeds, forgiving injuries, converting sinners, and exceeding love of God are private actions of private men, and may be performed by any good Christian. And therefore the remission of sins, that is ascribed to them, is no peculiar act of the ministry, but may be the act of any private Christian. Consequently so far laymen may be concerned in the remission of sins without any intrenchment upon the ministry. But these being only private acts, are of no further consideration in the present discourse, which only relates to ministerial absolution, and the public discipline of the Church.

I have now gone over all that relates to the exercise of peni-

enim Salvator, *Verumtamen date eleemosynam, et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis.* Quarta nobis fit remissio peccatorum per hoc, quod et nos remittimus peccata fratribus nostris. Sic enim dicit ipse Dominus et Salvator noster, *Quia si dimiseritis fratribus vestris ex corde peccata ipsorum, et vobis remittet Pater vester peccata vestra:* et sicut in oratione nos dicere docuit, *Remitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos remittimus debitoribus nostris.* Quinta remissio peccatorum est, cum *converterit quis peccatorem ab errore viæ suæ.... salvat animam ejus a morte, et cooperit multitudinem peccatorum.* Sexta quoque fit remissio per abundantiam caritatis, sicut et ipse Dominus dicit, *Amen dico, remittuntur ei peccata multa, quoniam dilexit multum.* Et Apostolus dicit, *Caritas cooperit multitudinem peccatorum.* Est adhuc et septima, licet dura et laboriosa, per pœnitentiam remissio peccatorum; cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum, et fiunt ei lacrymæ suæ panes die et nocte, et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum, et quærere medicinam.

tential discipline, so far as concerns the practice of the s
Church. As for doctrinal points, such as the question, W
penance be properly a sacrament? and whether sacc
absolution be necessary to salvation? these come not d
within the design of the present undertaking, which onl
siders *the practice* of the Church. But because I hav
occasion to write some little tracts upon the latter qu
and it will not be unacceptable to some readers to see
made public, I shall here subjoin them[39] by way of ap
to the present Discourse.

[39] [*The Two Sermons and Two Letters to the Lord Bishop of Winchester concerning the Nature and Necessity of Absolution, showing how far that necessity extends and where it ceases*, were originally published, 1720, at the end of this Book, which together with the seventeenth and eighteenth formed the eighth volume of my Ancestor's own edition. They would not be inappropriate here, but wishing not to interrupt the of the *Origines Ecclesiastica* selves, within the design of these tracts do not precisely c the learned Author himself a have deemed it best to place the tenth volume of this edit mediately after the French Apology and before the S ED.]

The end of the eighth volume of the original edition of 172

BOOK XX.

OF THE FESTIVALS OBSERVED IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the distinction to be made between civil and ecclesiastical festivals.

1. HAVING hitherto taken a distinct view of the great services of the ancient Church in the several parts of her Liturgy, and the administration of her sacraments, and the exercise of discipline, I come now to give an account of the lesser kind of observations relating to her festivals, and days of fasting, and marriage rites, and funeral rites, all which may, in some measure, be comprised under the general name of the service of the Church. **What meant by the civil festivals.**

In speaking of the festivals it will be necessary first of all to distinguish the ecclesiastical festivals from the civil. For some were purely ecclesiastical, others purely civil; and others (as festivals of greater account) were both ecclesiastical and civil. All Sundays throughout the year, and the fifteen days of the Paschal solemnity, were festivals both in the ecclesiastical and civil account. For they were not only days of more solemn religious observation, but also days of vacation from law-suits and prosecution of secular business. Other festivals were purely of ecclesiastical account: for they were days of religious assembly, but not entirely days of vacation. Others were purely civil festivals, that is, days of vacation from law-suits

and secular affairs, but not distinguished by any peculiar character of religious observation. Of this sort were the *feriæ æstivæ*, or *the thirty days of harvest;* and the *feriæ autumnales*, or *the thirty days of vintage;* and three days under the common name of the Kalends of January; one day called the *natalis urbis Romæ, the foundation of Rome;* and another the *natalis*, or *foundation of Constantinople;* and four days called the *natales imperatorum*, including both their *natural birthdays* and their *civil birthdays*, that is, their *inauguration to the empire.* Of all which, because there is frequent mention made of them in the ancient writers, and laws, and canons, it will not be amiss to speak a little more particularly in the entrance of this discourse.

Of the *feriæ æstivæ*, or thirty days of vacation in the harvest month, and the *feriæ autumnales.*

2. All these are comprehended in one law of Theodosius and Valentinian junior, under the general name of *feriæ forenses*, days of vacation or rest from pleadings in the civil courts of judicature. Where all days in the year are appointed to be juridical[1], except the two months of harvest and vintage, and the Kalends of January, and the *natales* of the two great cities, Rome and Constantinople, and the birthdays of the emperors, and their inauguration to the empire, and the fifteen days of Easter, which were festival both in the ecclesiastical and civil account, as also all Sundays throughout the year. Where it is rightly observed by Gothofred[2], that the other

[1] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 121.) Omnes dies jubemus esse juridicos. Illos tantum manere feriarum dies fas erit, quos geminis mensibus ad requiem laboris indulgentior annus accepit, æstivis fervoribus mitigandis, et autumnis fœtibus decerpendis. Kalendarum quoque Januariarum consuetos dies otio sancimus. His adjicimus natalitios dies urbium maximarum Romæ atque Constantinopolis, quibus debent jura deferre, quia et ab ipsis quoque nata sunt. Sanctos quoque Paschæ dies, qui septeno vel præcedunt numero, vel sequuntur, in eadem observatione numeramus. Necnon et dies solis, qui repetito in se calculo revolvuntur. Parum necesse est haberi reverentiam nostris etiam diebus, qui vel lucis auspicia, vel ortus imperii protulerunt.

[2] [In loc. (ibid. p. 125 col. dext.) Etsi Natalis quoque Domini, Epiphaniarum et Pentecostes solemnitas apud Christianos, ut feriarum dies, celebritate religiosa jam peragerentur, nondum tamen juridicis diebus in orbe Romano hoc tempore exempti fuere: quod ex hac lege liquet, ubi Paganorum etiam judicum multitudo adhuc magna erat, et quidem in ipsa urbe Roma: inter hæc scilicet initia satis visum, si inter festos Christianorum dies, Paschales dies, diesque solis juridicis eximerentur, veneratione Christianæ religionis, ac non etiam alii, quantumlibet feriati Christianorum dies, qui in diem solis non inciderent; sane spectacula hisce quoque diebus exhiberi, non minus quam Dominica, aut Paschatis, vetitum postea a Theodosio Juniore, in *d. l. Dominico ult. inf. de Spectaculis. Grischov.*]

ecclesiastical festivals of Christmas, Epiphany, and Pentecost, were not as yet made festivals in the civil account. For at his time many of the judges were still Heathens, and therefore iridical pleadings were allowed on these days, notwithstanding iat they were kept with great solemnity and religious venera-on among the Christians. But afterward, when Justinian peated this law in his Code[3], the prohibition of pleadings on these days, and upon the Passions of the Apostles, as inserted, together with a prohibition of all the public ows and games upon any of these solemnities, of which more reafter, [in the seventh chapter of this Book.]

As to those festivals which were purely civil, we are to ob-rve that some of them were of long standing in the Roman npire, and no new institution of Christians, but only reformed id regulated by them in some particulars, to cut off the olatrous rites and other corruptions that sometimes attended iem. The multitude of them was complained of by Tully[4], id therefore Augustus cut off thirty of them at once, turning ose days which were deputed for honorary games into days pleading, for the better prosecution of criminals and greater pedition of justice, as Suetonius[5] reports in his Life. And a

[3] L. 3. tit. 12. de Feriis. leg. 7. (t. p. 607.) Omnes dies jubemus esse ridicos. Illos tantum manere ferum dies fas erit, quos geminis ensibus ad requiem laboris indulntior annus excepit; æstivis feribus mitigandis, et autumno fructus decerpendis. Kalendarum quoe Januariarum consuetos dies otio ancipamus. His adjicimus natalis dies urbium maximarum, Romæ que Constantinopolis: in quibus bent jura differri, quia et ab ipsis ita sunt. Sacros quoque Paschæ es, qui septeno numero vel præcent, vel sequuntur. Dies etiam atalis, atque Epiphaniarum Christi, quo tempore commemoratio Apolicæ Passionis, totius Christianitis magistræ, a cunctis jure celeratur: in quibus etiam prædictis nctissimis diebus neque spectacurum copiam reseramus. In eadem bservatione numeramus et dies sos quos *Dominicos* rite dixere maires, qui repetito in sese calculo revolvuntur: in quibus parem necesse est habere reverentiam; ut nec apud ipsos arbitros, vel a judicibus flagitatos, vel sponte electos, ulla sit cognitio jurgiorum. Nostris etiam diebus, qui vel lucis auspicia, vel ortus imperii protulerunt. In quindecim autem Paschalibus diebus compulsio annonariæ functionis, et omnium publicorum privatorumque debitorum differatur exactio.

[4] Vid. cont. Verrem, [Act. Prima. n. 10. [al. 31.] (v. 3. p. 1069.) Nonæ sunt hodie Sextiles. Hora nona convenire cœpistis. Hunc diem jam ne numerant quidem. Decem dies sunt ante ludos votivos, quos Cn. Pompeius facturus est. Hi ludi quindecim dies auferent. Deinde continuo Romani consequentur. Ita prope XL diebus interpositis, tum denique se ad ea, quæ a nobis dicta erunt, responsuros se arbitrantur.

[5] Vit. Augusti, c. 32. (p. 73.) Ne quod autem maleficium negotiumve impunitate vel mora elaberetur, tri-

like reduction was made by Antoninus Philosophus, who is said[6] to have added several judiciary days to the calendar, striking out many festivals, and appointing two hundred and thirty days in the year for hearing of causes and dispatching business of the law. The Christian emperors reduced the number of these festivals to a much shorter compass. For they cast away all festivals that were held in honour of the Heathen gods: and though they brought in all Sundays in the year into the computation of civil festivals, and also the fifteen days of the Paschal solemnity, yet the whole number did not amount to above one hundred and twenty-five: so that there remained two hundred and forty days still for public business of the law. And of those one hundred and twenty-five days that were exempt, sixty days or two months were only set apart as days of vacation from the law for the convenience of gathering in the harvest and the vintage. The one were called *feriæ æstivæ*, and the other *feriæ autumnales*. And these were ancient Roman festivals, mentioned by Statius[7], and Aulus Gellius[8], and Pliny[9], and after them by Ulpian[10], the

ginta amplius dies, qui honorariis ludis occupabantur, actui rerum accommodavit.

[6] Vid. Capitolin. Vit. Antonini Philosoph. c. 10. p. 74. (int. August. Hist. Scriptor. p. 174.) Judiciariæ rei singularem diligentiam adhibuit; fastis dies judiciarios addidit, ita ut ducentos triginta dies annuos rebus agendis, litibusque disceptandis constitueret.

[7] Sylvar. l. 4. c. 4. v. 39. (Lugd. Bat. 1616. p. 88.)

Certe jam Latiæ non miscent jurgia leges.
Et pacem piger annus habet, messesque reversæ
Dimisere forum: nec jam tibi turba reorum
Vestibulo, querulique rogant exire clientes:
Cessat centeni moderatrix judicis hasta.

[8] Noct. Attic. l. 9. c. 15. (p. 461.) Cum Antonio Juliano rhetore, per feriarum tempus æstivarum, decedere ex urbis æstu volentes, Neapolin concesseramus.

[9] L. 8. Ep. 19. (p. 207.)... Julio mense, quo maxime lites interquiescunt.

[10] Digest. l. 2. tit. 12. de Feriis. leg. 1. (ap. Corp. Jur. Civ. t. 1. p. 197.) Ne quis messium vindemiarumque tempore adversarium cogat ad judicium venire, oratione Divi Marci exprimitur: quia occupati circa rem rusticum in forum compellendi non sunt, &c.—Ibid. (p. 198.) Sed excipiuntur certæ causæ, ex quibus cogi poterimus et per id temporis, cum messes vindemiæque sunt, ad prætores venire: scilicet si res tempore peritura sit, hoc est, si dilatio actionem sit peremptura. Sane quoties res urget, cogendi quidem sumus ad prætorem venire, verum ad hoc tantum cogi æquum est, ut lis contestetur et ita ipsis verbis orationis exprimitur: denique alterutro recusante post litem contestatam litigare, dilationem oratio concessit.—Leg. 2. (p. 198.) Eadem oratione Divus Marcus in senatu recitata effecit, de aliis speciebus prætorem adiri etiam diebus feriaticis: ut puta, ut tutores aut curatores dentur, ut officii admoneantur cessantes, excusationes

famous lawyer, who shows at large for what end they were appointed, that countrymen might not be molested in gathering their fruits at their proper seasons, except it were in some extraordinary cases, which required a more speedy decision before the prætor. The schools of rhetoric had also their vacations at these seasons, as we learn both from Aulus Gellius[11] and St. Austin[12]. And because this sort of *feriæ* had nothing of harm, but only convenience in them, they were continued without scruple by the Christian emperors, and established by their laws, as we have seen, upon consideration of the usefulness and necessity of them; leaving it to the judges of the several provinces of the world to determine precisely what time they should commence: for they did not begin the harvest month, or the vintage month, everywhere on the same day, but some countries sooner and some later, according to the different state and condition of every climate. And so the observation of these two months continued, as Gothofred[13] notes, to the time of the Emperor Otho, who first abrogated them in the laws of the Lombards.

Of the Kalends of January.

3. The next civil *feriæ* were the Kalends of January: which,

allegentur, alimenta constituantur, ætates probentur, ventris nomine in possessionem mittatur, vel rei servandæ causa, vel legatorum, fideive commissorum, vel damni infecti, &c. —Leg. 3. (p. 199.) Solet etiam messis vindemiarumque tempore jus dici de rebus, quæ tempore vel morte perituræ sunt. Morte, veluti furti, damni, injuriæ, injuriarum atrocium, qui de incendio, ruina, naufragio, rate, nave expugnata rapuisse dicuntur, et si quæ similes sunt. Item si res tempore perituræ sunt, aut actionis dies exiturus est. Liberalia quoque judicia omni tempore finiuntur. Item in eum, qui quid nundinarum nomine adversus communem utilitatem acceperit, omni tempore jus dicitur.

[11] See n. 8, preceding.

[12] Confess. l. 9. c. 2. (t. 1. p. 157 d.) Et placuit mihi in conspectu tuo non tumultuose abripere, sed leniter subtrahere ministerium linguæ meæ nundinis loquacitatis; ne ulterius pueri, meditantes non legem tuam, non pacem tuam, sed insanias mendaces et bella forensia, mercarentur ex ore meo arma furori suo. Et opportune jam paucissimi dies supererant ad vindemiales ferias, statui tolerare illos, ut solemniter abscederem, et redemtus a te jam non redirem venalis, &c.—Ibid. (p. 158 a.) Veruntamen quia propter nomen tuum, quod sanctificasti per terras, etiam laudatores utique haberet votum et propositum nostrum, jactantiæ simile videbatur, non operiri tam proximum feriarum tempus, sed de publica professione atque ante oculos omnium sita ante discedere, ut conversa in factum meum ora cunctorum intuentium, quam vicinum vindemialium diem prævenire voluerim, multa dicerent, quod quasi appetissem magnus videri.

[13] In Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 123. col. sinistr.) Tandem vero sublatæ fuerunt hæ feriæ ab Ottone, l. 2. tit. 49. Legis Longobardorum.

as Gothofred thinks, comprised three days, the day before the Kalends, the Kalends, and the third of the Nones, or as others[14] say, the day before the Nones, that is, the fourth of January, commonly called *Bota* and *Vota*[15], because it was the day of sacrificing for the emperor's safety. These were continued by the Christian emperors without any idolatrous rites, but still were days of great liberty and extravagance. Upon which account the ancient Fathers and Councils commonly declaim with great invectives against the observation of them. For not only Tertullian[16] speaks against them, whilst they were accompanied with idolatrous and superstitious rites in the time of Heathenism, but in after-ages the fathers in their popular discourses are often very severe and copious in their dissuasives from the observation of them, both upon the account of the relics of superstition remaining in the hearts of many Christians, and also because they were occasions of great looseness and debauchery among the people. St. Chrysostom[17] says, 'many were superstitiously addicted to the observation of times, and made divination and conjectures upon them; as, if they spent the new moon in mirth and pleasure, the whole year would be prosperous and lucky to them. So both men and women gave themselves to intemperance on these days out of this diabolical persuasion, that the good or bad fortune of the rest of the year depended upon such an ominous begin-

[14] Vid. Dempster. Paralipom. ad Rosin. Antiquit. l. 4. c. 4. p. 543. (p. 539 a.) De Calendis, Nonis, et Idibus.

[15] See b. 16. ch. 4. s. 17. v. 6. p. 231. n. 7.

[16] De Idolol. c. 14. (p. 93 d.) Nimirum Saturnalia et Kalendas Januarias celebrans hominibus placebat [*nempe* Paulus]? an modestia et patientia? an gravitate, an humanitate, an integritate? ... Judæis dies suos festos exprobrat Spiritus Sanctus. *Sabbata*, inquit, *vestra, et neomenias et cærimonias odit anima mea.* Nobis, quibus sabbata extranea sunt, et neomeniæ, et feriæ a Deo aliquando dilectæ, Saturnalia, et Januariæ, et Brumæ, et Matronales frequentantur? &c.

[17] Hom. 23. In eos, qui Novilunia observant. t. 1. p. 297. [Bened. in Kalendas] (t. 1. p. 699 a.) Οἱ δὲ ἐν τοῖς καπηλείοις ἀγῶνες γινόμενοι τήμερον, οὗτοι μὲν μάλιστα ὀδυνῶσι, καὶ ἀσωτείας καὶ ἀσεβείας ἐμπεπλησμένοι πολλῆς· ἀσεβείας μὲν, ὅτι παρατηροῦσιν ἡμέρας οἱ ταῦτα ποιοῦντες, καὶ οἰωνίζονται, καὶ νομίζουσιν, εἰ τὴν νουμηνίαν τοῦ μηνὸς τούτου μεθ' ἡδονῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἐπιτελέσαιεν, καὶ τὸν ἅπαντα τοιοῦτον ἕξειν ἐνιαυτόν· ἀσωτείας δὲ, ὅτι ὑπὸ τὴν ἕω γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες φιάλας καὶ ποτήρια πληρώσαντες μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀσωτείας τὸν ἄκρατον πίνουσι. ... Ἄλλως δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας ἂν εἴη, ἀπὸ τῆς μιᾶς ἡμέρας εἰ δεξιὰ γένοιτο, καὶ τοῦ παντὸς τοῦτο προσδοκᾶν ἐνιαυτοῦ· οὐκ ἀνοίας δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διαβολικῆς ἐνεργείας ἡ κρίσις αὕτη, μὴ τῇ οἰκείᾳ σπουδῇ καὶ προθυμίᾳ, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τῶν ἡμερῶν περιόδοις τὰ κατὰ τὸν βίον ἐπιτρέπειν τὸν ἡμέτερον.

ning of it. Which was the Devil's invention to ruin the practice of all virtue.' He observes further[18], that they were used in the celebration of these times to set up lamps in the market-place, and crown their doors with garlands, which he condemns together with their superstition and intemperance, as a mixture of diabolical pomp and childish folly. The like complaints are made by St. Austin[19], Chrysologus[20], Prudentius[21], Asterius Amasenus[22], and St. Ambrose[23]. So that though these festivals of the Kalends were allowed by the imperial laws, yet they were generally condemned by the ancient writers, because of the vanities and excesses and abuses that were usually committed in them. And particularly the Council of Trullo[24] forbids the dancings and other ceremonies that were used both by men and women on the Kalends and the Bota, under the penalty of excommunication: as I have had occasion to show more fully[25] in speaking of the discipline of the Church. And the Council of Auxerre takes notice of the remains of some Heathen superstition in France[26], in offering an hind or a calf, which they call *a diabolical observation.*

[18] Ibid. p. 300. (p. 701 b.) Τὸ πρὸς ἡμέρας ἐπτοῆσθαι τοιαύτας, καὶ πλείονα ἐν αὐταῖς δέχεσθαι ἡδονὴν, καὶ λύχνους ἅπτειν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, καὶ στεφανώματα πλέκειν, παιδικῆς ἀνοίας ἐστίν. . . Μὴ τὴν θύραν τῆς οἰκίας στεφανώσης, κ. τ. λ.

[19] Serm. 5. de Kalend. Januar. t. 10. p. 621. [al. Serm. 197. Ed. Bened. (t. 5. p. 904.) De Kalendis Januariis, contra Paganos, fragmenta reperta in Bedæ et Flori Collectione in Paulum ad Rom. c. 1. Ed.]

[20] Serm. 155. (p. 218.) Ubi nostram Christus, &c.

[21] L. 1. cont. Symmach. v. 237. (v. 1. p. 736.)

. . . Jano etiam celebri de mense litatur
Auspiciis epulisque sacris, quas inveterato,
Heu miseri! sub honore agitant, et gaudia ducunt
Festa Kalendarum. Sic observatio crevit,
Ex atavis quondam male cœpta: deinde secutis
Tradita temporibus, serisque nepotibus aucta,
Traxerunt longam corda inconsulta catenam,
Mosque tenebrosus vitiosa in sæcula fluxit.

[22] Hom. 4. de Fest. Kalendar. ap. Combefis. Auctar. Nov. (p. 65 b. 9.) . . . Πολλοὶ προτιμῶντες τὴν ἐκ τῆς ματαιότητος τρυφὴν καὶ ἀσχολίαν, κ. τ. λ.

[23] Serm. 17. [al. Serm. 7.] (t. 2. append. p. 400 a. n. 2.) Cur ubi Christus habitat, qui est abstinentia, temperantia, castitas, inducitur comessatio, &c.

[24] C. 62. (t. 6. p. 1170 d.) Τὰς οὕτω λεγομένας καλάνδας, καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα βότα, καὶ τὰ καλούμενα βρουμάλια, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ Μαρτίου μηνὸς ἡμέρᾳ τελουμένην πανήγυριν, καθάπαξ ἐκ τῆς τῶν πιστῶν πολιτείας περιαιρεθῆναι βουλόμεθα· ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰς τῶν γυναίων δημοσίας ὀρχήσεις, πολλὴν λύμην καὶ βλάβην ἐμποιεῖν δυναμένας . . . ἀποπεμπόμεθα.

[25] B. 16. ch. 4. s. 17. v. 6. p. 224.

[26] C. 1. (t. 5. p. 957 e.) Non licet Kalendis Januarii vecolo aut cervolo facere vel strenas diabolicas observare.—Sirmond and Labbe instead

Of the emperor's birthdays.

4. The next civil festivals were the emperors' birt which were of two sorts; the one was called *natalis gen their natural birthday;* and the other *natalis imperii inauguration;* as they are distinguished in several l the Theodosian Code[27], and other ancient writers, whi collected by Gothofred[28] in great abundance. Who a serves, that when it is said by ancient writers that Const was born in Britain, it is to be understood according distinction, to mean his imperial birthday, and not his n For his natural birth was at Naisus in Dacia, as Pagi[29] from many express testimonies of Julius Firmicus and S nus de Urbibus, and other ancient writers: but his in birth, or inauguration to the empire, was in Britain. Baronius and many other learned writers mistaking natural birth have thence concluded that he was b

of *vecolo*, read it *vetula*, prisco more pro *vitula*. [Vid. Sirmond. ad l. n. 2. (ap. Labb. ibid. p. 962 c.) Quidam libri *vecola* alii *væcola* aut *vecolo* legunt. Lectio nostra [vetula] auctorem habet sanctum Eligium in Sermone ad omnem Plebem: *Nemo in Kalendis Januariis nefanda et ridiculosa, vetulas aut cervolos, vel jocticos faciat, &c.* ... Hanc autem lectionem confirmat, simulque quid sit *vetula aut cervolo facere* docet vetus Pœnitentiale in codice Andegavensi: *Si quis*, inquit, *in Kalendis Januariis in cervulo et in vetula vadet, tribus annis pœniteat, quia hoc dæmonium est.* Utrobique porro *vetula* prisco more scriptum pro *vitula*. Ed.]

[27] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 121.) Parem necesse est haberi reverentiam nostris etiam diebus, qui vel lucis auspicia, vel ortus imperii protulerunt.—L. 6. tit. 26. de Proximis, leg. 11. (t. 2. p. 156.) ... Genuinus natalis nostri dies, &c.—Leg. 17. (ibid. p. 161.) ... Genuino die natalis meæ clementiæ, &c.

[28] In Cod. Theod. l. 1. tit. 8. leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 125.) Natalis suos, &c.

[29] Crit. in Baron. an. 306. n. 8. [al. 9.] (t. 1. p. 337.) Constantini Magni patriam fuisse Naissum, oppidum Daciæ mediterranea Serviæ dictæ, certum esse Hoc enim Stephanus de U qui nuper cum notis in H lucem vidit, Constantinus Po geneta (L. 2. Περὶ Θεμάτων), cus (L. 1. Matheseos, sub i et Anonymus Valesianus dise bis docent. *Hic igitur Const natus Helena matre vilissima* infirmæ conditionis) *in oppido atque eductus, quod oppidum magnifice ornavit, literis mi structus, obses apud Diocleti Galerium sub iisdem fortiter militavit*, inquit Anonymus nus. Accedit Cedrenus, q stantinum apud urbem Daciæ scribit. Decepit Anglos, viros doctissimos locus Pan Maximiano et Constantino quo legitur, *Liberavit ille*, (C tius, Constantini M. pater) *nias servitute; tu etiam nob illic oriendo fecisti.* Quæ et ita ab illis de Britannia accept natus illic Constantinus esse tamen oratoris mens sit, grat ibi ortum factumque impe Constantinum, ac uno verbo tali imperii, non de natali loquatur. Quare, quod Co nus Anglus sive Britannus inter fabulas computandum.

Britain. But this only by the way. These birthdays of the emperors, whether natural or political, were always of great esteem and veneration. The law of Theodosius orders them to be observed with the same reverence and ceremony as all other civil festivals, that is, to be days of vacation from public pleadings at the law: and on these days it was usual for great men to entertain the people with the public games and shows, which was partly to honour the days, and partly to give some diversion to the people. The prætor of Rome was obliged by his office to do this, as appears by several laws of Arcadius in the Theodosian Code[30]. And the judges might be present at them once a day in the morning[31], when they distributed money, some silver, some gold, according to their quality, among the people. And on these days the emperors' statues or images were produced for the people to pay their civil respect and veneration to them; reserving 'divine worship, and religious adoration, exceeding the dignity of man, to the Celestial Majesty alone,' as the laws[32] elegantly word it. But if it happened that any of these days fell upon a Sunday, then by a law of Theodosius the public games were omitted[33], and came not into the solemnity of the days. And Theodosius Junior excepted also the other great festivals of Christ's nativity, and Epiphany and Easter, and Pentecost, or the whole fifty days

[30] L. 6. tit. 4. de Prætoribus, leg. 19. (t. 2. p. 66.) Prætores, Romanus et Laureatus, natalibus nostri numinis scenicas populo præbeant voluptates.—Ibid. leg. 35. (p. 66.) Ex quinque prætoribus, qui aquæductui Theodosiaco fuerant deputati, unum, qui centum librarum argenti munificentiam suam definita erogatione præcludit, æterni principis ac fratris mei Honorii natalium festivitatibus præcipue deputari.

[31] Ibid. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 2. (t. 5. p. 350.) Nullus omnino judicum aut theatralibus ludis, aut circensium certaminibus, aut ferarum cursibus vacet, nisi illis tantum diebus, quibus vel in lucem editi, vel imperii sumus sceptra sortiti: hisque, ut ante meridiem tantum solemnitati pareant, post epulas vero ad spectaculum redire desistant. In quo tamen omnes sive judices, sive privati, nihil penitus auri præmio dandum esse cognoscent: quod solis licet consulibus, quibus erogandi moderationem vitæ meritis permisimus.

[32] Ibid. tit. 4. de Imaginibus, leg. 1. (p. 346.) Si quando nostræ statuæ vel imagines eriguntur, seu diebus, ut assolet, festis, sive communibus, adsit judex, sine adorationis ambitioso fastigio, ut ornamentum diei, vel loco et nostræ recordationi, sui probet accessisse præsentiam. Ludis quoque simulacra proposita tantum in animis concurrentum mentisque secretis nostrum numen et laudes vigere demonstret: excedens cultura hominum dignitatem Superno Numini reservetur.

[33] Ibid. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 2. (p. 350.) Nullus solis die populo spectacula præbeat, nec divinam venerationem confecta solemnitate confundat.

derived; and therefore it was proper that the feasts of their dedication should be observed by a vacation from lawsuits on the annual days of their foundation.'

This is the short account of the civil *feriæ*, or *festivals*, so far as concerns their observation under the government and allowance of Christian emperors. I now proceed to the other sort of festivals, which were of sacred or ecclesiastical observation.

CHAP. II.

Of the original and observation of the Lord's-day among Christians.

The Lord's-day of continued observation in the Church from the days of the Apostles, under the names of *Sunday, the Lord's-day, the first day of the week*, and *the day of breaking of bread, &c.*

1. THE principal and most noted among the sacred and ecclesiastical festivals was always that of the Lord's-day, which was observed with great veneration in the ancient Church from the very time of the Apostles. The Apostles themselves are often said to meet on this day for divine service, being the day of the Lord's resurrection. Thus, (Acts 20, 7.) "On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight." So again, (1 Cor. 16, 2.) "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." And St. John expressly styles it the Lord's-day: (Rev. 1, 10.) "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day." Which cannot mean the Jewish Sabbath: for then he would have called it so: nor any other day of the week: for that had been ambiguous: but the day on which Christ arose from the dead, on which the Apostles were used to meet to celebrate divine service, on which Paul had ordered collections to be made, according to the custom of the primitive Church. Seeing therefore he speaks of this as a day well known and used in the Church, it cannot be doubted but that it was distinguished by this name from the received use and custom of the Church. For otherwise how could Christians have understood what St. John intended to signify by this name, if he had designed to denote any other day by it? as Mr. Turretin[40] argues well upon the resolution of this question.

The matter thus founded in apostolical practice may be

[40] Theolog. part. 2. loc. 11. de Lege Dei, quæst. 14. s. 7. (t. 2. p. 103.).... Non sane Sabbatho Judæorum, quod procul dubio nomi-

further illustrated and confirmed from the general usage of the Church in the following ages. Pliny, who was an Heathen magistrate in the reign of Trajan not long after St. John's death, took the account of the Christian assemblies from the mouths of some apostatizing Christians, and they told him[41], 'their custom was to meet together early in the morning before it was light on a certain fixed day, and sing hymns to Christ as their God, and bind themselves with a sacrament to do no evil, and afterwards to partake of a common feast.' Which is a plain description of the service of the Lord's-day, and particularly of the *agape* or *feast of* charity, which was usually an attendant of the communion in the primitive Church every Lord's-day. Ignatius, who lived about the same time, makes as plain a reference to the observation of the Lord's-day, when he bids the Magnesians[42] 'not to sabbatize with the Jews, but to lead a life agreeable to the Lord's-day, on which our life was raised from the dead by him (that is, by the Lord Christ) and by his death.' Clemens Alexandrinus[43], as Cotelerius observes, well illustrates and explains this passage of Ignatius, showing what it is to lead a life conformable to the Lord's-day, when he says, 'He that observes the precepts of the Gospel, makes it to be the Lord's-day, whilst he casts away every evil thought, and takes to him the true *gnostic* thoughts of wisdom and knowledge, thereby glorifying the resurrection of the Lord.'

nasset, non aliquo tantum die septimanæ, quia sic ambiguus esset titulus ad implicandum potius, quam explicandum comparatus, sed die illo, quo Christus resurrexerat, quo convenire solebant Apostoli ad sacra peragenda, et quo Paulus ordinaverat collectas habendas, prout moris erat in primitiva ecclesia. Cum ergo de illa die tanquam nota et in ecclesia usitata loquatur, dubium non est, quin ex recepto ecclesiæ usu hoc nomine insignita sit. Quis enim alias Christianorum intellexisset, quid Johannes hac appellatione significasset, si quam aliam diem designare voluisset?

[41] L. 10. Ep. 97. (p. 278.) Affirmabant autem, hanc fuisse summam vel culpæ suæ, vel erroris, quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire, carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem: seque sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent. Quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium.

[42] Ep. ad Magnesian. n. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 20.) Μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες, κ. τ. λ.

[43] Stromat. 7. (p. 877. 28.) Οὗτος ἐντολὴν τὴν κατὰ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξάμενος, Κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ, ὅτ' ἂν ἀποβάλλῃ φαῦλον νόημα καὶ γνωστικὸν προσλάβῃ, τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀνάστασιν δοξάζων.

Hence we learn, that Κυριακὴ was the common name of the Lord's-day, and that Κυριακὴν ζῆν is *to lead a life conformable to the Lord's-day*, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. Yet sometimes the Ancients, when they write to the Gentiles, scruple not to call it *Sunday*, to distinguish it by the name best known to them. As Justin Martyr, writing his Apology to the Heathen[44], says, 'We all meet together on Sunday, on which God, having changed darkness and matter, created the world, and on this day Jesus Christ our Saviour arose from the dead.' In like manner Tertullian[45], answering the objection made by the Heathens, that the Christians worshipped the sun, says indeed 'they made Sunday a day of joy, but for other reasons than to worship the sun, which was no part of their religion.' At other times, when he writes only to Christians, he commonly uses the name of *the Lord's-day*[46], and especially when he would distinguish it[47] from the Jewish Sabbath. And the like may be observed in the laws of the first Christian emperors. Constantine[48] uses the name *Sunday*, when he forbids all lawsuits on this day. Valentinian[49] uses the same name upon the same occasion. So does also Valentinian Junior, and Theodosius Senior, and Theodosius Junior[50], in settling the observation of this day. But they use the name indifferently, styling it sometimes *the Lord's-day*, which was

[44] Apol. 2. (p. 99 a.) Τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα· ἐπειδὰν πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Θεὸς, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε· καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ ἡμέτερος Σωτὴρ, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη.

[45] Apol. c. 16. (p. 16 b.) Æque si die [al. diem] solis lætitiæ indulgemus, alia longe ratione quam religione solis, &c.—Ad Nation. l. 1. c. 13. (p. 50 a.) Alii... solem Christianum Deum æstimant, quod innotuerit ad orientis partem facere nos precationem, vel die solis lætitiam curare.

[46] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare.

[47] De Jejun. c. 15. (p. 553 a.) ...Exceptis scilicet Sabbatis et Dominicis.

[48] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 1. (t. 1. p. 118.) Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem solis, venerationis suæ celebrem, altercantibus jurgiis et noxiis partium contentionibus occupari, ita gratum ac jucundum est eo die, quæ sunt maxime votiva, compleri.

[49] Ibid. leg. 2. (ibid. p. 121.) Kalendarum Januariarum consuetos dies otio sancimus.... Nec non et dies solis, &c.

[50] Ibid. eod. l. 8. de Executoribus, leg. 1. (t. 2. p. 589.) Die solis neminem Christianum ab exactoribus volumus conveniri, &c.—Leg. 3. (p. 591.) Solis die, quem Dominicum rite dixere majores, omnium omnino litium, negotiorum, conventionum quiescat intentio, &c.—L. 11. tit. 7. de Exactionibus, leg. 10. (t. 4. p. 74.) Die solis, qui dudum faustus [al. festus] habetur, &c.—Leg. 13. (p. 76.) Solis die, quem

more proper among Christians, as is particularly noted in one of the laws of the younger Valentinian[51], which runs thus: *Solis die, quem Dominicum rite dixere majores, &c. On Sunday, which our forefathers have rightly and customarily called the Lord's-day.* His reference to ancient custom is confirmed not only from what has been alleged out of Ignatius and Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian, but from the use of the word Κυριακὴ in the Epistle of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth to Pope Soter, recorded by Eusebius[52], where he says, '*To-day we observed the Lord's holy day,—τὴν Κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν.*' And from what Eusebius[53] says of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, that he wrote a book *περὶ Κυριακῆς, concerning the Lord's-day.* In like manner Irenæus in his Epistle to Pope Victor[54] says, 'The mystery of the Lord's resurrection, or the Paschal festival, ought to be kept only *on the Lord's-day,—τῇ τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ.*' And Origen[55], to distinguish it from the Jewish Sabbath, says, 'that manna was rained down from heaven on the Lord's-day, and not on the Sabbath, to show the Jews, that even then the Lord's-day was preferred before it.'

This evidences not only the antiquity of the name, but that the observation of the day in memory of our Lord's resurrection was the universal practice of the Church from the time of the Apostles. And from one solemn act of breaking bread in

Dominicum rite dixere majores, &c. —L. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 2. (t. 5. p. 350.) Nullus solis die populo spectacula præbeat, &c.

[51] Ibid. l. 11. tit. 7. de Exactionibus, leg. 13. (t. 4. p. 76.) Solis die, quem Dominicum rite dixere majores, &c.

[52] L. 4. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 187. 6.) *Τὴν σήμερον οὖν Κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν.*

[53] Ibid. c. 26. (p. 188. 23.) *Μελίτωνος τὰ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα δύο,. . .καὶ ὁ περὶ Κυριακῆς λόγος.*

[54] Ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (ibid. p. 245. 14.).... *Ὁ Εἰρηναῖος.... παρίσταται μὲν τὸ δεῖν ἐν μόνῃ τῇ τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐπιτελεῖσθαι μυστήριον.*

[55] Hom. 7. in Exod. 15. t. 1. p. 82. (t. 2. p. 154 a.) Quod si ex divinis Scripturis hoc constat, quod die Dominica Deus pluit manna de cœlo, et in Sabbato non pluit, intelligant Judæi, jam tunc prælatam esse Dominicam nostram Judaico Sabbato, &c.—See also the Canon Paschalis of Hippolytus, cited by Gothofred, in Cod. Theod. l. 8. tit. 8. leg. 3. (t. 2. p. 592.)

ΕΤΕΙ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣ
ΤΩ. Α. ΑΡΧΗ
ΑΙ ΚΥΡΙΑΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΣΧΑ ΚΑΤΑ
ΕΤΟΣ.

Item:

ΑΠΟΜΝΗΣΘΗΣΕΣΘΑΙ ΔΕ ΔΕΙ
ΟΤΑΝ ΕΜΠΕΣΗ ΚΥΡΙΑΚΗ.

the constant celebration of the eucharist on this day, I have once before observed[56], out of Chrysostom, that it is sometimes called, *dies panis, the day of bread*, because it was the general custom in the primitive Church to meet for breaking of bread, and receiving of the communion on every Lord's-day throughout the year. And I shall not need here to be more particular concerning this, or any other part of the public service performed on the Lord's-day, such as psalmody, reading of the Scriptures, preaching, and praying, and exercising discipline upon penitents, and absolving them, because I have treated largely of these in their order in several Books before: but now only take notice of some special laws and customs that were observed, to show a more peculiar reverence, honour and respect to the supereminent dignity of this day.

All proceedings at law forbidden and suspended on this day, except such as were of absolute necessity or great charity: as manumission of slaves, &c.

2. Among these we may reckon in the first place those imperial laws, which suspended all actions and proceedings at the law on this day, whether arrests, pleadings, exactions, sentences of judges, or executions: except only such as were of absolute necessity or some eminent charity, as the manumission of slaves, or granting them their freedom, which was not forbidden, because it was an act of considerable charity and great mercy. This was the same respect as the old Roman laws had paid to their *feriæ* or *festivals* in times of idolatry and superstition. But as then the Lord's-day was of no account among the Heathen, so no exemption was made in its favour; but this was juridical as well as any other, till Constantine made the first law to exempt it. And now also the Christian laws concerning the observation of the Lord's-day, which exempted it from being juridical, still admitted of some exceptions, as the Heathen laws in relation to their *feriæ* had done before them. The exceptions made by the Heathen laws are particularly specified by Ulpian[57], out of the Edicts of

[56] B. 15. ch. 9. s. 2. v. 5. p. 539.

[57] Digest. l. 2. tit. 12. de Feriis, leg. 2. (Corp. Jur. Civ. t. 1. p. 198.) .... Divus Marcus.... effecit, de aliis speciebus prætorem adiri etiam diebus feriaticis: utputa ut tutores aut curatores dentur.... vel rei servandæ causa, vel legatorum, fideive commissorum, vel damni infecti: item de testamentis exhibendis: ut curator detur bonorum ejus, qui an hæres exstiturus sit, incertum est: aut de alendis liberis, parentibus, patronis: aut de adeunda suspecta hæreditate: aut ut aspectu atrox injuria æstimetur; vel fidei commissaria libertas præstanda.—Ibid. leg. 3. (p. 199.) Solet etiam messis vindemiarumque tempore jus dici de rebus, quæ tempore vel morte peri-

Trajan and Marcus Antoninus, where the hearing of all causes of absolute necessity and great charity, and about all military affairs, is allowed on their festivals: as the appointing of curators and guardians to orphans, and causes relating to matters of preservation and damage, and legacies and trusts, and exhibiting of wills, and maintenance of children, parents, and patrons: and all causes wherein a man might suffer great damage either by delay or by death, as in case of theft, or great injuries and losses by fire, or shipwreck, or piracies, or any cases of the like nature.

Now as the old Roman laws exempted the festivals of the Heathen from all juridical business, and suspended all processes and pleadings, except in the forementioned cases: so Constantine ordered that the same honour and respect should be paid to the Lord's-day; that it should be a day of perfect vacation from all prosecutions, and pleadings, and business of the law, except where any case of great necessity or charity required a juridical process and public transaction: for such cases were always thought to be consistent with the design of the rest both of the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, as our Lord himself had interpreted the law of the Sabbath in many cases of beneficence and doing good, both by his doctrine and his example. Therefore Constantine peremptorily forbad[58] all his judges to hear any causes either criminal or civil on this day, except such as could not be deferred without intrenching upon the rules of charity; which sort of actions and causes the law calls *votiva, good offices*, such as the emancipation or manumission of slaves, which he allows any one to perform in a legal manner on this day, and there should lie no prohibition against them. Honorius in like manner[59] excepts the causes that were com-

turæ sunt. Morte, veluti furti, damni, injuriæ, injuriarum atrocium, qui de incendio, ruina, naufragio, rate, nave expugnata rapuisse dicuntur, et si quæ similes sunt.—Ibid. leg. 9. (p. 202.).... Quæ ad disciplinam militarem pertinent, etiam feriatis diebus peragenda, &c.

[58] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 1. (t. 1. p. 118.) Sicut indignissimum videbatur, diem solis, veneratione sui celebrem, altercantibus jurgiis et noxiis partium contentionibus occupari, ita gratum ac jocundum est, eo die quæ sunt maxime votiva compleri: atque ideo et mancipandi et manumittendi die festo cuncti licentiam habeant, et super his rebus actus non prohibeantur.—Vid. Cod. Justin. l. 3. tit. 12. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 4. p. 606.) Ut in die Dominico emancipare ac manumittere liceat, reliquæ causæ vel lites quiescant, &c.

[59] Cod. Theod. l. 13. tit. 5. de Naviculariis, leg. 38, (t. 5. p. 90.).

menced against the *navicularii*, or *masters of vessels*, transporting the public corn from Afric to Rome: if any fraud was suspected in them, they were to be examined by torture upon any festivals or days of devotion without delay or molestation: because the preservation of the public corn was a matter of great concern to the public welfare of Rome, bread being the staff of life; and therefore inquisition into such frauds was proper to be made upon any day whatsoever without exception. For the same reason Honorius and Theodosius Junior, by another law[60], ordered prosecution to be made against the Isaurian pirates on any day, not excepting Lent or Easter-day; lest the discovery of wicked designs should be delayed, which was to be effected only by putting the robbers to the rack in their examination; which it was to be hoped the great God would readily pardon, seeing the preservation and safety of many innocent men was procured thereby. So that in such cases, where mercy and charity or the necessities of the public good were concerned, all days were juridical, and actions at law might be prosecuted on the Lord's-day as well as any other. But excepting these particular cases, the prosecution of lawsuits on this day was universally forbidden. Valentinian Senior prohibited[61] all arrests of men for debt, whether public or private, on this day. For no man might be convened even by the exactors of the public revenues, under pain of incurring the emperor's highest displeasure for the breach of this law. Valentinian Junior speaks a little more expressly[62]: 'On

Hujusmodi igitur inquisitio etiam diebus feriatis et devotionum absque ulla observatione peragenda est.

[60] Cod. Theod. l. 9. tit. 35. de Quæstionibus, leg. 7. (t. 3. p. 255.) Provinciarum judices moneantur, ut in Isaurorum latronum quæstionibus nullum Quadragesimæ, nec venerabilem Pascharum diem existiment excipiendum: ne dieratur sceleratorum proditio consiliorum, quæ per latronum tormenta quærenda est; cum facillime in hoc Summi Numinis speratur venia, per quod multorum salus et incolumitas procuratur.

[61] Ibid. l. 8. tit. 8. de Executoribus, leg. 1. (t. 2. p. 589.) Die solis, qui dudum faustus habetur, neminem Christianum ab exactoribus volumus conveniri; contra eos, qui id facere ausi sint, hoc nostri statuti interdicto periculum sancientes.—This is repeated, Cod. Theod. l. 11. tit. 7. de Exactionibus, leg. 10. (t. 4. p. 74.)

[62] Ibid. leg. 3. (t. 2. p. 591.) Solis die, quem Dominicum rite dixere majores, omnium omnino litium, negotiorum, conventionum quiescat intentio: debitum publicum privatumve nullus efflagitet: ne apud ipsos quidem arbitros, vel in judiciis flagitatos, vel sponte delectos, ulla sit agnitio jurgiorum. Et non modo notabilis, verum etiam sacrilegus judicetur, qui a sanctæ religionis instituto rituve deflexerit.—This law is also repeated, Cod. Theod. l. 11. tit.

Sunday, which our forefathers rightly called the Lord's-day, let all prosecution of causes, controversial business and disputes, be wholly laid aside: let no one demand either a public or a private debt: let there be no hearing of causes either before arbitrators appointed by law, or voluntarily chosen. And let him be accounted not only infamous, but sacrilegious also, whoever departs from the rule and custom of our holy religion. And the same Valentinian, together with Theodosius the Great, has another law[63], wherein he appoints all Sundays in the year to be days of vacation from all business of the law whatsoever, according to the observation of other festivals.

All secular business forbidden, except such as necessity or charity compelled men to, as gathering of their fruits in harvest, by some laws.

3. Neither was it only business of the law, but all other secular and servile labour and employments that were superseded on this day, except only such as men were called to by necessity or some great charity; as earing and harvest, which at first were allowed on this day, that men might not be disappointed of their seasons; and the visiting of prisoners by the bishops and judges, which was so far from intrenching upon the sacred rest of this day, that it was a necessary office of mercy and charity, which the laws enjoined them. Eusebius, in the Life of Constantine[64] takes notice of two laws made by him in relation to his army, whom he obliged to rest from all military exercise on this day. And whereas some of them were Heathens. and some Christians, by the first law he obliged that part of his army, which were Christians, to repair with all diligence to the Church of God: and that they might have more liberty and leisure to attend their prayers there, he discharged them from all other business and employment on that day. As to the other part of the army which were still Heathens, he obliged them by a second law to repair into the open fields, and there having laid aside their arms, with one consent

7. de Exactionibus, leg. 13. (t. 4. p. 76.)

[63] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 121.) Necnon et dies solis, qui repetito in se calculo revolvuntur, in eadem observatione numeramus.—See also to the same purpose the law of Leo and Anthemius, Cod. Justin. l. 3. c. 12. de Feriis, leg. 11. (t. 4. p. 608.) Dominicum itaque diem ita semper honorabilem decernimus et venerandum; ut a cunctis exsecutionibus excusetur: nulla quenquam urgeat admonitio: nulla fidejussionis flagitetur exactio: taceat apparitio: advocatio delitescat: sit ille dies a cognitionibus alienus: præconis horrida vox silescat: respirent a controversiis litigantes, et habeant fœderis intervallum, &c.

[64] L. 4. cc. 18, 19, 20. (v. 1. pp. 635, 636.)

bound in prison might mercifully be relieved, according to the command of God: and the bishop was to appoint some faithful and diligent person to provide them necessaries, and to see that they had a competent sustenance out of the Church.' This was an act of great mercy, and therefore justly excepted from the common works and employments that were forbidden on the Lord's-day. However, in the Justinian Code[70], this work is transferred from the Lord's-day to Wednesdays and Fridays, which were days also of church-assemblies, but not so strictly observed as the Lord's-day; and by other laws[71] that liberty which Constantine granted to countrymen to follow their works of husbandry on the Lord's-day, was in a great measure restrained.

Private writers, and the canons of the Church, also run against it. Irenæus, expounding the law of the Sabbath[72], thus expresses his sense of it: 'Though the Law did not forbid those that were hungry to take meat, and eat of such things as were next at hand; yet *metere et colligere in horreum vetabat, it did forbid men to reap, and carry into barns.* (Exod. 34, 21.) "Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing time and harvest thou shalt rest."' Tertullian[73] in like manner says, 'The law of the Sabbath forbids all human works, but not divine. Consequently it forbids all those works which are enjoined on the six days, namely, their own works, that is, human works, or works of their daily vocation. But such a work as the Levites' carrying about the ark on the Sabbath, was no human or common work, but sa-

[70] L. 9. tit. 4. de Custodia Reorum, leg. 4. (t. 4. p. 2324. ad calc.) Χρὴ δὲ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, κατὰ Τετράδην ἢ Παρασκεύην, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι τοὺς ἐν φυλακῇ, κ. τ. λ.

[71] Novel. 54. (ad calc. Corp. Jur. Civ. Ed. Amstel. 1663. t. 2. p. 259.) ..... Καὶ μήτε γεωργὸν, μήτε τινὰ ἅπτισθαι ἔργων ἐν ταύτῃ τῶν μὴ νενομισμένων.

[72] L. 4. c. 20. (p. 305. 16.).... Esurientes accipere Sabbatis escas ex his, quæ adjacebant, non vetabat lex: metere autem et colligere in horreum vetebat.

[73] Cont. Marcion. l. 2. c. 21. (p. 392 c.) .... Contrarietates præceptorum ei exprobras, ut mobili et instabili, prohibentis Sabbatis operari, et jubentis arcam circumferri per dies octo, id est, etiam Sabbato, in expugnatione civitatis Hiericho. Nec Sabbati enim inspicis legem, opera humana, non divina, prohibentem. Siquidem sex, inquit, diebus operare, et facies omnia opera tua. Septima autem die Sabbata Domino Deo tuo; non facies in ea omne opus, quod utique tuum. Consequens enim est, ut ea opera Sabbato auferret, quæ sex diebus supra indixerat, tua scilicet, id est, humana et quotidiana. Arcam vero circumferre, neque quotidianum opus videri potest, neque humanum; sed et rarum et sacrosanctum, et ex ipso tunc Dei præcepto utique Divinum.

cred and divine by God's express command.' St. Austin, or whoever was the author of the Sermons *de Tempore*[74], says, 'The Apostles transferred the observation of the Sabbath to the Lord's-day, and therefore from the evening of the Sabbath to the evening of the Lord's-day, men ought to abstain from all country work and secular business, and only attend divine service.' Some think this homily is one of Cæsarius Arelatensis, a French bishop, which is very probable: for the French Councils about his time are very express in forbidding works of husbandry on the Lord's-day. The third Council of Orleans[75] distinguishes between the Jewish and Christian way of observing the Lord's-day: for 'whereas some people were persuaded, that it was unlawful to travel on the Lord's-day, either with horses, or oxen, or chariots, or to dress any victuals, or to do any thing pertaining to cleanliness of house or man: which came nearer the Jewish than the Christian observation:' they therefore decreed, 'that all things might lawfully be done that were used to be done before.' But however men ought to abstain from all country work, as husbandry, dressing of vineyards, reaping and mowing, and threshing, that they may have more liberty to come to church, and offer up their prayers to God. So likewise the Council of Auxerre[76]: 'It is not lawful on the Lord's-day to yoke oxen, or do any works of the like nature.' And the second Council of Mascon[77]: 'Let no one on

[74] Hom. 251. de Temp. t. 10. p. 307. [al. Append. Serm. 280.] (t. 5. append. p. 467 c.) Ac ideo sancti doctores ecclesiæ decreverunt omnem gloriam Judaici sabbatismi in diem Dominicam transferre, ut, quod ipsi in figura, nos celebraremus in veritate.... Observemus ergo diem Dominicam et sanctificemus illam, sicut antiquis præceptum est de Sabbato, dicente Legislatore, *A vespera usque ad vesperam celebratis Sabbata vestra.* Videamus ne otium nostrum vanum sit, sed, a vespera diei Sabbati usque ad vesperam diei Dominici sequestrati a rurali opere et ab omni negotio, soli divino cultui vacemus.

[75] C. 27. [al. 28.] (t. 5. p. 302 d.) Quia persuasum est populis, die Dominico cum caballis et bobus et vehiculis itinerare [al. agi itinera] non debere, neque ullam rem ad victum præparare, vel ad nitorem domus vel hominis pertinentem nullatenus exercere: quæ res [quia] ad Judæam [al. Judaicam] magis, quam ad observantiam Christianam pertinere probatur; id statuimus, die Dominico, quod ante fieri licuit, licere [al. liceat]. De opere tamen rurali, id est, agricultura [al. arato], vel vinea, vel sectione, [vel] messione, [vel] excussione, vel exsecta sepe [al. exarto vel sepe], censuimus abstinendum, quo facilius ad ecclesiam [con]venientes orationis gratia vacent.

[76] C. 16. (ibid. p. 959 a.) Non licet die Dominico boves jungere, vel alia opera exercere.

[77] C. 1. (ibid. p. 980 e.) Nullus vestrum litium fomitibus vacet: nullus causarum actiones exerceat: nemo sibi talem necessitatem exhibeat, quæ jugum cervicibus jumen-

this day prosecute a lawsuit, no lawyer plead any causes, no one put himself under the necessity of yoking his oxen. But be ye all intent and ready both in body and mind to sing hymns and praises to God. If any one contemn this admonition, he shall be punished according to the quality of his offence. If he be a lawyer, he shall lose his privilege of pleading; if he be a countryman or slave, he shall be severely beaten with rods; if a clergyman or monk, he shall be six months suspended from the communion of his brethren.'

There are a great many other French and Spanish Councils to the time of Charles the Great[78] that have canons prohibiting the same thing: which show, that the liberty indulged by Constantine, of working at husbandry on the Lord's-day, was never well approved by the Church: but it was no easy matter to restrain men from the use of that first liberty, which the law had granted them, and therefore they continued to enjoy the indulgence, which had so plausible a pretence; and in

torum imponere cogat. Estote omnes in hymnis et laudibus Dei animo corporeque intenti..... Si quis vestrum ..... hanc salubrem exhortationem parvi penderit, aut contemptui tradiderit, sciat se pro qualitatis merito principaliter a Deo puniri, et deinceps sacerdotali quoque iræ implacabiliter subjacere. Si causidicus fuerit, irreparabiliter causam amittet: si rusticus aut servus, gravioribus fustium ictibus verberabitur: si clericus aut monachus, mensibus sex a consortio suspendetur fratrum.

[78] Vid. Præceptum Guntramni Regis, ad calc. C. Matiscon. 2. (t. 5. p. 992 b.) Idcirco hujus decreti ac definitionis generalis vigore decernimus, ut in omnibus diebus Dominicis, in quibus sanctæ resurrectionis mysterium veneramur, vel in quibuscunque reliquis solemnitatibus, quando ex more ad veneranda templorum oracula universæ plebis conjunctio devotionis congregatur studio, præter victum quem præparari convenit, ab omni corporali opere suspendantur, nec ulla causarum præcipue jurgia moveantur.—C. Arelatens. 6. c. 16. (t. 7. p. 1237 e.) Ne in diebus Dominicis publica mercata, neque causationes disceptationesque exerceantur, et penitus a rurali et servili opere cessetur: his solummodo peractis, quæ ad Dei cultum et servitium pertinere noscuntur.—C. Mogunt. sub Carol. M. c. 37. (ibid. p. 1250 d.) Omnes dies Dominicos cum omni veneratione decrevimus observari et a servili opere abstinere: et ut mercatus in eis minime sit, nec placitum, ubi aliquis ad mortem vel ad pœnam judicetur.—C. Turon. 3. sub eod. c. 40. (ibid. p. 1267 d.) Interdicatur, ne mercata et placita usquam fiant die Dominica, qua oportet omnes Christianos a servili opere in laude Dei et gratiarum actione usque ad vesperam perseverare.—C. Remens. c. 35. (ibid. p. 1257 e.) Ut diebus Dominicis, secundum Domini præceptum, nulla opera servilia quilibet perficiat, nec ad placita conveniat, nec etiam donationes in publico facere præsumat, neque mercata exerceat. [The Author also cites C. Tolet. 11. c. 8. (t. 6. p. 550 c.) and C. Cabill. 2. c. 18. (t. 7. p. 1276 b.), but the places referred to contain nothing on the subject in hand. Ed.]

many places the evil increased; for some kept courts, and pleaded causes, and kept fairs and markets, and traded on this day as well as any other, as appears from the several complaints made against these things in the time of Charles the Great, who endeavoured among other things to correct these abuses in his reformation.

But the Church did not only oppose the profaners of the Lord's-day, but all such as with a pharisaical superstition on the other hand pretended to carry the observation of it to an unreasonable rigour and strictness in abstaining from all bodily labour. The Dositheans among the Jews are noted by Origen[79], as putting a ridiculous sense upon the law of Moses, [Exod. 16, 29.] which said, "Abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." This they interpreted so literally and rigorously, as that whatever habit, place, or posture a man was found in on the Sabbath-day, he was to continue in it till the evening: that is, if he was found sitting, he must sit still all the day; or if lying down, he must lie all the day. The Jewish rabbins were as ridiculous in their confutation of this dream of Dositheus; for they pretended to say, out of some fabulous and frivolous traditions, that every man's place was the space of two thousand cubits round him; and, therefore, he that travelled no further[80], was not reputed to move out of his place. They were no less ridiculous in interpreting those other laws against working and bearing bur-

[79] Περὶ ἀρχῶν. l. 4. c. 2. [n. 17.] p. 743. [juxt. Ruffin. Interpret.] (t. 1. p. 176.) ... Alii vero, ex quibus Dositheus Samaritanus,... ridiculosius aliquid statuunt, quia unusquisque quo habitu, quo loco, qua positione in die Sabbati fuerit inventus, ita usque ad vesperam debeat permanere; id est, vel si sedens, ut sedeat tota die; vel si jacens, ut tota die jaceat.—This is repeated in Origen's Philocalia, c. 1. p. 14. ad calc. Libr. cont. Cels. Cantabr. 1677. (Paris. 1619. p. 36.) Οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς ..... φλυαροῦσιν εὑρεσιλογοῦντες, ψυχρὰς παραδόσεις φέροντες· ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τοῦ Σαββάτου, φάσκοντες τόπον ἑκάστῳ εἶναι διοχιλίους πήχεις· ἄλλοι δὲ, ὧν ἐστι Δοσίθεος ὁ Σαμαρεὺς, καταγινώσκοντες τῆς τοιαύτης διηγήσεως, οἴονται ἐπὶ τοῦ σχήματος, οὗ ἂν καταληφθῇ τις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Σαββάτου, μένειν μέχρις ἑσπέρας· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μὴ αἴρειν βάσταγμα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Σαββάτου, ἀμήχανον· διόπερ εἰς ἀπεραντολογίαν οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων διδάσκαλοι ἐληλύθασι λέγοντες, βάσταγμα μὲν εἶναι τὸ τοιόνδε ὑπόδημα, οὐ μὴν καὶ τὸ τοιόνδε, καὶ τὸ ἥλους ἔχον σανδάλιον, οὐ μὴν καὶ τὸ ἀνήλωτον· καὶ τὸ τωσὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὤμου φορούμενον, οὐ μὴν καὶ ἐπὶ δύο ὤμων.

[80] L. 4. c. 2. p. 743. (ibid. p. 176, antea.) Fabulas autem inanes et frivolas commentantur, ex nescio quibus traditionibus proferentes de Sabbato, dicentes, unicuique locum suum reputari intra duo millia ulnarum.

dens on the Sabbath-day. They said[81], 'If a man had nails in his shoes, it was reputed a burden; but if he had no nails, it was no burden. If he carried any thing upon one shoulder, it was a burden; but if upon both shoulders, it was none.' And some of them were so superstitious, as if their lives lay at stake, they would not move a finger to help themselves, for fear they should be thought to break the Sabbath by working. Synesius[82] gives a famous instance of this in a certain Jewish pilot, who was steering a ship in a violent tempest: he laboured hard till the Sabbath came on, but then he let go the helm, and left the ship to the mercy of the winds and sea; and though a soldier threatened him with present death, unless he would resume his labour, yet he refused, and, like a true Maccabee, was ready to sacrifice his life to his superstition. But afterwards, upon second thoughts, about midnight he betook himself to his post, saying, Now the law allows it, because we run the hazard of our lives. Synesius elegantly calls him a Maccabee for his first resolution, because a thousand of the Maccabees suffered themselves to be cut in pieces by their enemies, rather than they would take the sword in hand to fight, or do any thing to defend themselves on the Sabbath-day; which made Mattathias and his friends decree, that whoever should come to make battle with them on the Sabbath-day,

[81] Ibid. (p. 179.) Ad fabulas infinitas .... Judæorum doctores devoluti sunt dicentes, non reputari onus, si calceamenta quis habeat sine clavis; onus vero esse, si caligulas quis cum clavis habuerit. Et si quidem super unum humerum aliquid portaverit, onus judicant; si vero supra utrumque, negabunt esse onus.

[82] Ep. 4. ad Euoptium. (p. 161 d. et p. 162.) Ἡμέρα μὲν οὖν ἦν, ἥν τινα ἄγουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι Παρασκευήν· τὴν δὲ νύκτα τῇ μετ' αὐτὴν ἡμέρᾳ λογίζονται, καθ' ἣν οὐδενὶ θέμις ἐστὶν ἐνεργὸν ἔχειν τὴν χεῖρα, ἀλλὰ τιμῶντες διαφερόντως αὐτὴν, ἄγουσιν ἀπραξίαν· μεθῆκεν οὖν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὁ κυβερνήτης τὸ πηδάλιον, ἐπειδὰν τὸν ἥλιον εἴκασεν ἀπολελοιπέναι τὴν γῆν· καὶ, καταβαλὼν ἑαυτὸν,

Πατεῖν παρεῖχε τῷ θέλοντι ναυτίλων.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν μὲν οὖσαν αἰτίαν οὐκ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ νοῦν ἐβαλλόμεθα· ἀπόγνωσιν δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα οἰόμενοι, προσήειμεν, ἐλιπαροῦμεν μὴ καταπροέσθαι μηδέπω τὰς ἐσχάτας ἐλπίδας· καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἐπεῖχον αἱ τρικυμίαι, τοῦ πελάγους καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸ στασιάσαντος. .... Ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν συνήκαμεν τὸν νοῦν τῆς ἀπολείψεως τῶν πηδαλίων,.... πειθοῦς ἀπογνόντες, ἀνάγκην ἤδη προσήγομεν. Καί τις στρατιώτης γεννάδας ..... τὸ ξίφος σπασάμενος, ἠπείλησε τ' ἀνθρώπῳ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκόψειν, εἰ μὴ ἀντιλήψοιτο τοῦ σκάφους· ὁ δὲ αὐτόχρημα Μακκαβαῖος οἷος ἦν ἐγκαρτερῆσαι τῷ δόγματι· μεσούσης δὲ ἤδη τῆς νυκτὸς, παρ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀναπείθεται πρὸς τῇ καθέδρᾳ γενέσθαι. Νῦν γάρ, φησιν, ὁ νόμος ἐφίησιν, ἐπειδὰν νῦν σαφῶς τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς θέομεν.

they would fight against him, and not die all, as their brethren that were murdered in the secret places. (1 Maccab. 2, 41.) And the Jewish pilot wisely bethought himself in time of this example, and so saved the ship at last by working on the Sabbath. Josephus[83] says, this decree of Mattathias was observed by the Jews in part: for if they were in present danger of their lives, they would fight on the Sabbath; but if the enemy only made preparation for an assault the next day, and did not actually assault them on the Sabbath, they would do nothing to oppose them on that day. And this gave occasion to Pompey first, and to Titus afterward to overcome them. The Essenes were yet more rigorous: for they would not kindle a fire, nor move a vessel out of its place on the Sabbath-day. And the Dositheans exceeded all the rest, as we have heard before, in superstitious madness. The Christians, therefore, in opposition to these furies, were careful to observe a just medium in the celebration of the Lord's-day, neither to indulge themselves in the liberty of unnecessary works on this day, nor wholly to abstain from working, if a great occasion required it.

The Council of Laodicea[84] thus determines the matter, in settling the observation both of the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, between which they put this difference,—that Christians should not Judaize, or rest from bodily labour on the Sabbath, but work on that day, (that is, so far as divine service would permit); but they were to give preference in this respect to the Lord's-day, and to rest, if possible, and abstain from working. But if any were found to Judaize, they were to be anathematized as great transgressors. Balsamon[85] and Zonaras[86] upon

[83] Antiquit. Jud. l. 14. c. 8. (Huds. 4. n. 2. v. 1. p. 614. 4.) Εἰ δὲ μὴ πάτριον ἦν ἡμῖν ἀργεῖν τὰς ἑβδομάδας ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἠνύσθη τὸ χῶμα, κωλυόντων ἐκείνων· ἄρχοντας γὰρ μάχης καὶ τύπτοντας ἀμύνασθαι δίδωσιν ὁ νόμος, ἄλλο δέ τι δρῶντας τοὺς πολεμίους οὐκ ἐᾷ.

[84] C. 29. (t. 1. p. 1501 c.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ Χριστιανοὺς Ἰουδαΐζειν, καὶ ἐν τῷ Σαββάτῳ σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ· τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν προτιμῶντες, εἴγε δύναιντο, σχολάζειν ὡς Χριστιανοί. εἰ δὲ εὑρεθεῖεν Ἰουδαΐσταὶ ἔστωσαν ἀνάθεμα παρὰ Χριστῷ.

[85] [In loc. p. 839 d. (ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 1. p. 466 a.) Προσέθεντο, εἴγε δύναιντο, οἱ πιστοί. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκ πενίας ἢ ἄλλης τινὸς ἀνάγκης, καὶ κατὰ τὴν κυριώνυμον ἐργάζεταί τις, οὐ προκριματισθήσεται. *Grischov.*]

[86] [In loc. eund. (ibid. p. 466 b.) Ὁ μὲν κανὼν, εἰ δύναιντο, προσέθετο· ὁ δὲ πολιτείας νόμος ἀπαραίτητον τὴν ἀργίαν ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ ἀπαιτεῖ, ἄνευ τῶν γεωργῶν· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐν Κυριακῇ ἐργάζεσθαι ἐφίησιν, ὅτι ἴσως τῶν ἔρ-

this canon very well observe, that the words *εἴγε δύναιτο, if possible,* suppose some special cases that may dispense with men's working on the Lord's-day, as extreme poverty and want; to which may be added all other cases of necessity, as fighting to preserve men's lives against an enemy, toiling at the helm and oar to escape the violence of a tempest, travelling to church for the service of God, dressing of food for the life of man, labouring to deliver a man or beast in manifest danger of death, and any the like cases, which are all so reasonable, that the greatest adversaries of our Saviour, when he proposed some such cases, could not but own the justness of his proceedings. And from his example the Christian Church took her measures, in stating the exceptions that were proper to be made to the law about working on the Lord's-day, in contradistinction to the perverse way of observing the Jewish Sabbath.

No public games, or shows, or ludicrous recreations allowed on this day.

4. Another thing, which the Christian laws took care of, to secure the honour and dignity of the Lord's-day, was, that no ludicrous sports, or games, or recreations, however allowable at other times, should be followed or frequented on this day. There are two famous laws of Theodosius Senior, and his grandson, Theodosius Junior, to this purpose in the Theodosian Code. The first[87] peremptorily forbids any one, who either by his office or otherwise had any concern in exhibiting the public games to the people, to gratify them with any thing of this kind on the Lord's-day, whether it were a gymnastical exercise of gladiators in the theatre, or a stage-play, or an horse-race in the circus, or an hunting and fighting of wild beasts, lest the worship of God should be disturbed and confounded with any such entertainments as these. And the other[88] extends the prohibition of these pleasures, as well to the festival of Christ's Nativity, and Epiphany, and Easter, and Pentecost,

γων κατεπειγόντων, οὔκ εὑρήσουσιν ἄλλην ἡμέραν οὕτως αὐτοῖς εἰς τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν συμβαλλομένην. Grischov.]

[87] L. 15. de Spectaculis, tit. 5. leg. 2. (t. 5. p. 350.) Nullis solis die populo spectacula præbeat, nec divinam venerationem confecta solemnitate confundat.

[88] Ibid. leg. 5. (p. 353.) Dominico, qui septimanæ totius primus est dies, et Natali, atque Epiphaniorum Christi, Paschæ etiam et Quinquagesimæ diebus ..... omni theatrorum atque circensium voluptate per universas urbes earundem populis denegata, totæ Christianorum mentes Dei cultibus occupantur, &c.

as to the Lord's-day; and equally enjoins both Jews and Gentiles over all the world so far to show a respect to these days, as to know how to make a distinction between times of supplication and times of pleasure. Nor should it be any excuse for any one to plead, he exhibited such diversions to the people in honour of the emperor's birthday, which might happen to fall in with some of these seasons: for they were given to understand, that no greater honour could be paid to his Imperial Majesty on earth, than to have a just respect and veneration shown to the Majesty of Almighty God in heaven. A like order was made by Leo and Anthemius[89], 'that no stage-play, nor games of the circus, nor hunting of wild beasts, should be performed on this day. And if it so happened that any of the emperor's birthdays fell upon the Lord's-day, the observation of their birthday should be put off to another day. And whoever transgressed this order, either by exhibiting these games, or by being present at them as a spectator only; if he were a military man, he should forfeit his office; if a private man, be liable to confiscation of all his goods.' And the same penalty is imposed on all judges, advocates, and apparitors, that pretended to prosecute any business of the law upon this day.

The Church was no less careful to guard the service of this day from the encroachment of all vain pastimes and needless recreations. The Jews, though they would not work on their Sabbath, yet made no scruple to spend it in idleness, or worse exercises than any innocent bodily labour, as dancing, and revelling, and other unlawful pleasures; against which the Ancients often inveigh, and endeavour to dissuade their people from following so bad an example. 'The Jews in our time,' says St. Austin[90], 'celebrate their Sabbath in a sort of rest, which is nothing but a corporal laziness, languid, vain, and luxurious. For they rest only for trifling vanities; and when God commands them to observe the Sabbath, they exercise the Sabbath in those things which God forbids. Our rest is from

[89] Cod. Justin. l. 3. tit. 12. de Feriis, leg. 11. See b. 16. ch. 8. s. 4. v. 6. p. 373. n. 64.

[90] In Ps. 91. t. 8. p. 417. (t. 4. p. 982 a.) Hunc [diem Sabbati] in præsenti tempore otio quodam corporaliter languido et fluxo et luxurioso celebrant Judæi. Vacant enim ad nugas ... Vacatio nostra a malis operibus, vacatio illorum a bonis operibus est. Melius est enim arare, quam saltare. Illi ab opere bono vacant; ab opere nugatorio non vacant.

evil works, their rest is from good works. For it is better to go to ploughing, than, as they do, to dancing. They rest from good works, but rest not from works of vanity and trifling.' So in another place[91], 'A Jew would do better to work in his field at some useful labour, than spend his time at the theatre in a seditious manner. And their women had much better spin on the Sabbath, than spend the whole day on their new moons in immodest dancing. Therefore God commands thee to observe the Sabbath spiritually, not as the Jews do, in carnal rest, to satisfy their vanity and luxury.' Prudentius[92] brings the same charge against the Jews, objecting to them their misemploying the Sabbath in lascivious dancing: and Ruffin[92], on those words of Hosea, (2, 11.) "I will cause all her mirth to cease, her feast-days, her new moons, and her Sabbaths, and all her solemn feasts," says, 'These were the feasts in which the whole nation spent their time in dancing, singing, and lascivious banquetings.' St. Chrysostom[94] also objects it to them, 'that when

[91] De Decem Chordis, c. 3. t. 9. p. 269. [al. Serm. 9. c. 3.] (t. 5. p. 50 c.) Dicitur tibi, ut spiritaliter observes Sabbatum; non quomodo Judæi observant carnali otio: vacare enim volunt ad nugas atque luxurias suas. Melius faceret Judæus in agro suo aliquid utile, quam in theatro seditiosus exsisteret. Et melius fœminæ eorum die Sabbati lanam facerent, quam totam diem in menianis suis impudice saltarent. [Editi, *in neomeniis*. Verius aliquot MSS. *in menianis*. Sic enim in Joan. Evang. Tractat. 3. n. 19. (t. 3. part. 311 b.) There the same words occur, on which the Benedictine Editors make a similar remark, and add, *Meniana Veteres vocant podiolos seu domorum solaria.*—Vid. Du Fresne, Glossar. Med. et Infim. Latinit. (Paris. 1733. t. 4. col. 665.) Menianum, *projectio, projectus*, ἐξώστης. Gloss. Lat. Græc. MS. Sangerman. Georgius Florus de Expedit. Caroli VIII. in Neapolit. Reg. apud Gotofredum ad eundem Reg. p. 236. *Nam quod Helvetium ad meniana quædam, ut spectaret, conscendentem, &c.* Ubi *meniana* ædificia interpretatur vir doctissimus. Vox nota Latio: vide Festum et Nonium.—Conf. Lexic. Forcellin. et Facciolat. (Patavii, 1828. t. 3. p. 10.) Mænianum .... ἐξώστρα, tabulatum, vel lapis extra parietem projectus, et ad prospiciendum aptus: [Anglice, *a balcony?*] dictus a quodam Mænio, qui primus ultra columnas, ut ait Festus, extendit tegna, quo ampliarentur superiora .... Mænianum etiam fuit in privatorum domibus, quod Veneti vulgo *diago* ab ἡλιακὸν, *solarium*, vocant; Itali vero *ballatojo, pergolo* ..... Alii lapide, alii materia ædificavere porticibus mæniana, et foribus et domibus adjicerunt, &c. Ed.]

[92] Apotheos. v. 350. (v. 1. p. 467.)
—— Sacer ille tibi redeuntibus annis,
Sed sacer in pecude. Stultum est sic credere sacrum;
Sanguine balantis summos contingere postes,
Lascivire choris, &c.

[93] In Hos. 2. 11.—Ap. Oper. Ruffin. 1580. fol. (ap. Migne, Patrolog. t. 21. p. 976.) Posuit nomina feriarum, in quibus plurimum lætabatur, cum tota regio choreis, canticis, epulisque lasciviret.

[94] Hom. 1. de Lazaro. t. 5. p. 32. (t. 1. p. 717 a.).... Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, τῶν βιωτικῶν ἀπαλλαγέντες πραγμάτων,

they were delivered from secular cares, they had no regard to spiritual things, sobriety, modesty, and hearing the Word of God, but did all things contrary, serving their belly, indulging drunkenness, stuffing themselves with meat and delicacies, and spending their time in banquetings and pleasures.' This was their way of keeping the Sabbaths, which St. Chrysostom, following the Septuagint[95], (Amos 6, 3—6.) calls Σάββατα ψευδῆ, *false Sabbaths*, when "they lay upon beds of ivory, and stretched themselves upon their couches, and ate the lambs out of the flock, and the calves out of the midst of the stall; chanting to the sound of the viol, and inventing to themselves instruments of music, like David; drinking wine in bowls, and anointing themselves with the chief ointment, but were not grieved for the affliction of Joseph!" Which agrees with the character which another Prophet gives of them: "The harp and the viol, the tabret and pipe and wine, are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord, nor consider the operation of his hands." (Isa. 5, 12.) Theodoret[96] in like manner reflects upon their abuse of the Sabbatical rest in lascivious dancing: and again[97] on the effeminacy and luxury wherein they indulged themselves on this day. Upon which account both he[98] and Cyril of Alexandria[99] apply to them the forementioned words of Amos, and charge them with keeping false Sabbaths. Their luxury and banqueting on this day was become so extravagant and infamous, that it was noted even to a proverb. Cotelerius[1] thinks the phrase *luxus Sabbatarius*, in

τοῖς πνευματικοῖς οὐ προσεῖχον, σωφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἐπιεικείᾳ, καὶ ἀκροάσει θείων λογίων· ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ἐποίουν, γαστριζόμενοι, μεθύοντες, διαρρηγνύμενοι, τρυφῶντες.

[95] [Vid. Ed. Lambert. Bos, Franequer. 1709. (p. 1097.) Οἱ ἐρχόμενοι εἰς ἡμέραν κακὴν, οἱ ἐγγίζοντες καὶ ἐφαπτόμενοι Σαββάτων ψευδῶν. ED.]

[96] Quæst. 32. in Levit. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 210.) Οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν οὐ σκυθρωπάζουσιν, ἀλλὰ γελῶσι, καὶ παίζουσι, καὶ χορεύουσι, καὶ ἀκολάστοις ῥήμασι καὶ πράγμασι κέχρηνται, ἄντικρυς τῷ νόμῳ μαχόμενοι.

[97] In Phil. 3, 19. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 465.) Διαφερόντως οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πολλὴν ποιοῦνται τροφῆς ἐπιμέλειαν, καὶ δικαιοσύνης ὅρον νομίζουσι τὴν ἐν Σαββάτῳ χλιδὴν· δόξαν ταῦτα ὑπολαμβάνοντες, ἐφ' οἷς ἔδει αἰσχύνεσθαι.

[98] In Amos 6, 3. (t. 2. part. 2. p. 1435.) Οἱ ἐγγίζοντες καὶ ἐφαπτόμενοι Σαββάτων ψευδῶν. Οἱ τῷ δοκεῖν τιμῶντες τὰ Σάββατα, μυρία δὲ αὐτοῖς παράνομα δρῶντες, κ. τ. λ.

[99] In eund. loc. (t. 3. p. 314 e.) Ἐφαπτόμενοι Σαββάτων ψευδῶν.... Ἐπετρίβουν δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐν Σαββάτοις ἀργίας, πλὴν οὐκ εἰσάπαν ἠκριβωμένως, ἀτημελῶς δὲ πάμπαν καὶ ῥαθύμως κομιδῇ.

[1] In Pseudo-Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 59. n. 60.) .... Certe in proverbium abiit *sab-*

Sidonius Apollinarius[2], has reference to this; though Savaro[3] interprets it as spoken of Theodoric and his Arian Goths keeping Saturday as a feast, in opposition to the Roman Church, who made it a weekly fast, as we shall see more in the next chapter. The Heathens indeed had a quite contrary notion of the Jews; for they thought they fasted on their Sabbath, which was a vulgar mistake in them, arising merely from a misapprehension of their laws and practice: for because they kindled no fires, nor dressed any meat on the Sabbath, they wrongfully concluded that they spent the day in fasting. Whereas, the Christian writers, who better understood their practice, charge them every where with making it a day of rioting, and drunkenness, and excess of unlawful pleasures; and as such they earnestly caution those of their own religion against imitating the Jews in such perverse and abominable corruptions of the law, by turning a day of spiritual rest into a day of carnal pleasure.

But beside the example of the Jews, Christians were under another temptation from the practice of the Gentiles. Therefore the fourth Council of Carthage made a decree[4], 'that if any one forsook the solemn assembly of the Church on the Lord's-day, to go to a public show, he should be excommunicated.' St. Chrysostom[5] threatens the same punishment, co-

batarius luxus Apollinari Sidonio, l. 1. epist. 2.

[2] L. 1. Ep. 2. (p. 6.) De luxu autem illo sabbatario narrationi meæ supersedendum est.

[3] [In loc. (p. 16.) Quid sit *sabbatarius luxus*, liquido non liquet. Si locus conjecturæ, sabbatarius luxus est ita dictus, quod Gothi Ariani Sabbato genio indulgerent, et opipare convivarentur, (quo die Catholici et Romani jejunabant,) more Arianorum Aërianorumque, qui diebus, quibus Christiani abstinebant, odio fidei Catholicæ epulabantur.... Atque ita cum in universo orbe Romano die Sabbati jejunium celebraretur, et Ariani studia in contrarium destinarent, hac die helluabantur, diemque Saturni otio et victui decernebant more Sabbatariorum; idcirco dixit Sidonius *sabbatarium luxum*. Die autem solis, cum lætitiæ Christiani indulgerent, et jejunare nefas ducerent, illi abstinebant. *Grischov.*]

[4] C. 88. (t. 2. p. 1206 e.) Qui die solemni, prætermisso solemni ecclesiæ conventu, ad spectacula vadit, excommunicetur.

[5] Hom. 6. in Gen. t. 2. p. 53. (t. 4. p. 42 c.) Ἀλλ' ὅπως μὴ πάλιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς περιπέσητε, μηδὲ, μετὰ τὴν τοσαύτην ἡμῶν παραίνεσιν, πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ σατανικὰ συνέδρια ἐκεῖνα δράμητε, ἀναγκαῖον διαμαρτύρεσθαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ πάντοτε καλὸν προσηνῆ φάρμακα ἐπιτιθέναι, ἀλλ' ὅταν ᾖ τὸ ἕλκος δυσένδοτον, δεῖ καὶ τὰ στύφοντα καὶ τὰ δάκνειν δυνάμενα προσάγειν, ἵνα ταχεῖα γένηται ἡ διόρθωσις. Μαθέτωσαν τοίνυν ἅπαντες, οἱ τοῖς ἐγκλήμασιν ὑπεύθυνοι, ὅτι εἰ καὶ μετὰ ταύτην ἡμῶν τὴν παραίνεσιν πάλιν τῇ αὐτῇ ῥαθυμίᾳ

piously declaiming against the public games, as the conventions of Satan. The African fathers, in one of their general Synods[6], petitioned the Emperor Honorius, 'that the spectacles both of the theatre and other games might be wholly omitted on the Lord's-day, and all other noted festivals of the Christian religion, because they had found by sad experience, that even upon the Sunday, called the Octaves of Easter, the people met more at the horse-races in the circus, than at church: and therefore they thought, if any such days as were devoted to these pleasures, as the emperors' birthdays, or the like, happened to fall upon a Sunday, it ought to be transferred to some other day; and no Heathen should have power to compel a Christian to be a spectator of them upon any occasion.' For by the ecclesiastical law[7] these sorts of diversions were universally forbidden to all Christians, for the extravagances and blasphemies that were committed in them. What care was taken by Honorius to satisfy these demands, and remedy the abuses here complained of, appears not from any law of his in either of the Codes, but rather that he refused to comply with their request to prohibit the games and shows upon any other festivals beside the Lord's-day, which had been prohibited before. For by one of his laws[8], anno 399, he granted license to the people to solemnize and frequent their usual games and diversions on any public days of rejoicing, only forbidding

ἐπιμένωσιν, οὐκ ἀνεξόμεθα, ἀλλὰ τοῖς νόμοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας χρησάμενοι μετὰ πολλῆς αὐτοὺς τῆς σφοδρότητος διδάξομεν, μὴ τοιαῦτα πλημμελεῖν, κ. τ. λ.

[6] Cod. Canon. Afric. c. 61. (t. 2. p. 1086 e.) Κἀκεῖνο ἔτι, κ. τ. λ.—Cf. C. vulgo dictum Africanum, c. 28. (ibid. p. 1085 e.) Nec non et illud petendum, ut spectacula theatrorum cæterorumque ludorum die Dominica, vel cæteris religionis Christianæ diebus celeberrimis, amoveantur: maxime, quia sancti Paschæ octavarum die populi ad circum magis, quam ad ecclesiam conveniunt: et debere transferri devotionis eorum dies, si quando occurrerint: nec oportere etiam quenquam Christianorum cogi ad hæc spectacula.

[7] Vid. C. Carth. 3. c. 11. (ibid. p. 1169 c.) Ut filii episcoporum vel clericorum spectacula sæcularia non exhibeant, sed nec spectent, quandoquidem a spectaculo et omnes laici prohibeantur. Semper enim Christianis omnibus hoc interdictum est, ut, ubi blasphemi sunt, non accedant.

[8] Cod. Theod. lib. 16. tit. 10. de Paganis, leg. 17. (t. 6. p. 284.) Ut profanos ritus jam salubri lege submovimus, ita festos conventus civium, et communem omnium lætitiam non patimur submoveri. Unde absque ulla sacrificio atque ulla superstitione damnabili, exhibere populo voluptates, secundum veterem consuetudinem: inire etiam festa convivia, si quando exigunt publica vota, decernimus.

sacrifices and other superstitious rites of the Heathen. But not long after, Theodosius Junior published that famous law called *Dominico*[9], wherein he not only restrained the people from celebrating their games on the Lord's-day, but on all other solemn festivals, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, and Pentecost, and obliged both Jews and Gentiles over all the world to show a respect to these days, by putting a distinction between days of supplication and days of pleasure. And this became the standing law of the Roman empire.

fasting ıibited his day, ı in the ı of t.

5. But we are here to note, that such recreations and relaxations or refreshments, as contributed only to the preservation or convenience of the life of man, or had any tendency to promote the performance of divine worship with greater decency or perfection, were no ways comprehended in this prohibition of recreations and diversions on the Lord's-day. Therefore though the ancient Church was very strict in observing her stated and solemn fasts, yet she never allowed any fast to be held on the Lord's-day, no not even in Lent, out of which the Sabbath and the Lord's-day were generally excepted, and made days of common recreation and refreshment. Tertullian[10] says in general, that they counted it a crime to fast on the Lord's-day. And he remarks in particular concerning the Montanists[11], that though they were more rigid than others in observing their fasts, yet they omitted every Sabbath and Lord's-day throughout the year. St. Ambrose[12] says, they fasted not even in Lent either on the Sabbath or the Lord's-day: but condemned the Manichees particularly for fasting on the Lord's-day, as in effect denying the Lord's resurrection[13], which is also noted by St. Austin[14]; and Pope Leo[15] condemns

[9] Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. See before in this section, n. 87, preceding.

[10] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. See before, s. 1. p. 234. n. 46.

[11] De Jejun. c. 15. (p. 552 c.) Quantula est enim apud nos interdictio ciborum? Duas in anno hebdomadas xerophagiarum, nec totas, exceptis scilicet Sabbatis et Dominicis, offerimus Deo; abstinentes ab eis, quæ non rejicimus, sed [non] differimus.

[12] De Elia et Jejun. c. 10. (t. 1. p. 545 b. n. 34.) Quadragesima totis præter Sabbatum et Dominicam jejunatur diebus.

[13] Ep. 83. [al. 23.] de Pasch. Celebrand. Ration. (t. 2. p. 883 c. n. 11.) [Die] Dominica autem jejunare non possumus, quia Manichæos etiam ob istius diei jejunia jure damnamus. Hoc est enim in resurrectionem Christi non credere, &c.

[14] Ep. 86. [al. 36.] ad Casulan. Vid. c. 12. tot. (t. 2. p. 80 a.) Nunc vero postea quam hæretici, maxime impiissimi Manichæi, jejunia diei

the Priscillianists for the same practice. The fourth Council of Carthage[16] reckons him no Catholic that fasts upon this day. The first Council of Braga[17] particularly anathematizes the Cerdonians, Marcionites, Priscillianists, and Manichees, for their perverseness in this particular. And there are more general anathemas in the Apostolical Canons[18], and the Council of Gangra[19], and the Councils of Saragossa[20] and Agde[21], and the Council of Trullo[22], against all that under any pretence whatever presumed to make the Lord's-day a fasting day; which was not allowed to those who led an ascetic life, without suspicion of some perverse and heterodox opinion.

Dominici non aliqua necessitate occurrente peragere, sed quasi sacra solemnitate statuta dogmatizare cœperunt, et innotuerunt populis Christianis; profecto nec tali necessitate, qualem Apostolus habuit, [vid. Act. 20, 7—11.] existimo faciendum esse quod fecit: ne majus malum incurratur in scandalo, quam bonum percipiatur ex verbo, &c.

[15] Ep. 93. ad Turribium, c. 4. (CC. t. 3. p. 1412 b.) Quarto capitulo continetur, quod natalem Christi, quem secundum susceptionem veri hominis Catholica ecclesia veneratur, quia *Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis*, non vere isti honorent sed honorare se simulent, jejunantes eodem die, sicut et die Dominico, qui est dies resurrectionis Christi. Quod utique ideo faciunt, qui Christum Dominum in vera hominis natura natum esse non credunt, sed per quandam illusionem ostentata videri volunt, quæ vera non fuerint; sequentes dogmata Cerdonis atque Marcionis, et cognatis suis Manichæis per omnia consonantes [al. concordantes]. Qui sicut in nostra examine detecti atque convicti sunt, Dominicum diem, quem nobis Salvatoris nostri resurrectio consecravit, exigunt in mœrore jejunii; solis, ut proditum est, reverentiæ hanc continentiam devoventes; ut per omnia sint a nostræ fidei unitate discordes; et dies, quæ a nobis in lætitia habetur, ab illis in afflictione ducatur. Unde dignum est, ut inimici crucis Christi et resurrectionis talem excipiant sententiam, qualem elegerunt doctrinam.

[16] C. 64. (t. 2. p. 1205 b.) Qui Dominico die studiose jejunat, non credatur Catholicus.

[17] [Al. Bracar. 2.] c. 4. (t. 5. p. 837 e.) Si quis natalem Christi secundum carnem non bene honorat, sed honorare se simulat, jejunans eodem die, et in Dominico; quia Christum in vera hominis natura natum esse non credit, sicut Cerdon, Marcion, Manichæus, et Priscillianus, anathema sit.

[18] C. 64. [al. 65.] (Cotel. [c. 56.] v. 1. p. 446.) *Εἴ τις κληρικὸς εὑρεθῇ τὴν Κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, ἢ τὸ Σάββατον, πλὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς μόνου νηστεύων, καθαιρείσθω· ἐὰν δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀφοριζέσθω.*

[19] C. 18. (t. 2. p. 424 b.) *Εἴ τις διὰ νομιζομένην ἄσκησιν ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ νηστεύοι, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

[20] C. 2. (ibid. p. 1009 e.) Ne quis jejunet die Dominica, causa temporis, aut persuasionis, aut superstitionis.

[21] C. 12. (t. 4. p. 1385 d.) Placuit, ut omnes ecclesiæ filii, exceptis diebus Dominicis, in Quadragesima, etiam die Sabbato, sacerdotali ordinatione, et districtionis comminatione jejunent.

[22] C. 55. (t. 6. p. 1167 d.) *Ἐπειδὴ μεμαθήκαμεν ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις τῆς Τεσσαρακοστῆς νηστείας τοῖς ταύτης Σάββασι νηστεύειν, παρὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀκολουθίαν, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ὥστε κρατεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρασαλεύτως τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα, Εἴ τις κληρικὸς εὑρεθείη τῇ ἁγίᾳ Κυριακῇ νηστεύων ἢ τὸ Σάββα-*

Whence Epiphanius[23] observes, that the true ascetics of the Church never fasted on the Lord's-day, no not in Lent, because it was against the custom of the Catholic Church. And the like observation is made by Cassian[24] of all the monks in the East, 'that they fasted five days in the week, but on the *hebdomas* and *ogdoas*,' (that is, *the seventh* and *the eighth day*, for so he terms the Sabbath and the Lord's-day,) 'they always abstained from fasting, and kept them festival.' Nor would the Council of Gangra allow the Eustathians to fast on the Lord's-day, as ascetics, under pain of *anathema*.

The reason of this observation, the same Cassian[25] tells us, was the respect they had to our Saviour's resurrection from the dead on this day, which they always commemorated with joyfulness, and therefore neither fasted on this day, nor the whole fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, which were all kept festival in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. The same is said by the author of the Constitutions[26]: 'Every Sab-

τον, πλὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου, καθαιρείσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀφοριζέσθω.

[23] Expos. Fid. n. 22. (t. 1. p. 1105 b.) *Προαιρέσει ἀγαθῇ οἱ αὐτῆς ἀσκηταὶ διαπαντὸς, χωρὶς Κυριακῆς καὶ Πεντακοστῆς, νηστεύουσι, καὶ ἀγρυπνίας διαπαντὸς ἐπιτελοῦσι· τὰς δὲ Κυριακὰς ἁπάσας τρυφερὰς ἡγεῖται ἡ ἁγία αὕτη Καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, καὶ συνάξεις ἀφ' ἕωθεν ἐπιτελεῖ, οὐ νηστεύει· ἀνακόλουθον γάρ ἐστιν ἐν Κυριακῇ νηστεύειν. Τὴν δὲ Τεσσαρακοστὴν τὴν πρὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἁγίου Πάσχα ὡσαύτως φυλάττειν εἴωθεν ἡ αὐτὴ ἐκκλησία, ἐν νηστείαις διατελοῦσα· τὰς δὲ Κυριακὰς οὐδ' ὅλως, οὔτε ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Τεσσαρακοστῇ.* —Vid. Hieron. Ep. 28. [al. 71.] ad Lucinium Bœticum. (t. 1. p. 433 a.) Nec hoc dico, quod diebus festis [al. Dominicis] jejunandum putem, et contextas quinquaginta diebus ferias auferam, &c.

[24] Instit. l. 3. c. 9. (p. 45.) Ideoque et absolutio jejunii post vigiliarum laborem, totidem apostolicis viris in die Sabbati statuta, non immerito præsumitur per universas Orientis ecclesias secundum illam quoque Ecclesiastæ sententiam, quæ licet habeat et alium mysticum sensum, tamen ab hoc quoque non abhorret; quo utrique diei, id est, hebdomadi pariter et ogdoadi, eandem partem solemnitatis impartire præcipimur, ita dicentis, *Da partem his septem, et quidem his octo.* Non enim ad communionem festivitatis Judaicæ absolutio ista jejunii reputanda est, his præsertim, qui ab omni Judaica superstitione alieni monstrantur, sed ad refectionem, quam diximus, lassi corporis pertinere; quod per totas anni septimanas jugiter quinis diebus jejunans, nisi duobus saltem interpositis refocillatum fuerit, facile lassescit ac deficit.

[25] Collat. 21. c. 20. (p. 566.) ... Per omnia eandem in illis [quinquaginta diebus] solemnitatem, quam die Dominica custodimus, in qua majores nostri nec jejunium agendum, nec genu esse flectendum, ob reverentiam resurrectionis Dominicæ tradiderunt.

[26] L. 5. c. 20. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 327.) *Πᾶν μέν τοι Σάββατον ἄνευ τοῦ ἑνὸς, καὶ πᾶσαν Κυριακὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες συνόδους, εὐφραίνεσθε· ἔνοχος γὰρ ἁμαρτίας ἔσται ὁ τὴν Κυριακὴν νηστεύων, ἡμέραν ἀναστάσεως οὖσαν, ἢ τὴν Πεν-*

bath except one, (viz. the great Sabbath before Easter,) and every Lord's-day, ye shall keep festival. For he is guilty of sin that fasts on the Lord's-day, as being the day of his resurrection; or whoever makes Pentecost or the Lord's-day a day of sorrow. For in these days we ought to rejoice, and not to mourn.' So again[27], 'Keep the Sabbath and the Lord's-day festival: because the one is the commemoration of the creation, and the other of the resurrection.' In like manner, Peter[28], bishop of Alexandria: 'We keep the Lord's-day as a day of joy, because of him who rose upon it.' And Cotelerius[29] cites a fragment of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, to the same purpose: 'Both custom and decency require us to keep the Lord's-day a festival, and to give honour to it, because on this day our Lord Jesus Christ procured for us the resurrection from the dead.' Yet this rule was not so strictly binding, but that when a necessary occasion required, and there was no suspicion of heretical perverseness or contempt, men might fast upon this day: as St. Jerom[30] observes, that the Apostle Paul sometimes did; and that famous monk, who for the space of forty years never eat till the sun was set; and Celerinus the Confessor, in Cyprian, speaking of his sisters' lapsing into idolatry in time of the persecution, says[31], 'for this fact I wept day and night in the midst of the joyful festival of Easter, and spent many days sorrowing in sackcloth and ashes.' But such exceptions as these were no derogation to the general practice, which prevailed universally over the whole Church, and was observed with great exactness.

τηκοστὴν, ἢ ὅλως ἡμέραν ἑορτῆς Κυρίου κατηφῶν· εὐφρανθῆναι γὰρ δεῖ ἐν αὐταῖς, ἀλλ' οὐ πενθῆσαι.

[27] Ibid. l. 7. c. 23. [al. 24.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 369.) *Τὸ Σάββατον μέν τοι καὶ τὴν Κυριακὴν ἑορτάζετε, ὅτι τὸ μὲν δημιουργίας ἐστὶν ὑπόμνημα, ἡ δὲ ἀναστάσεως.*

[28] C. 15. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 2. part 1. p. 23. (CC. t. 1. p. 968 e.) *Κυριακὴν χαρμοσύνης ἡμέραν ἄγομεν διὰ τὸν ἀναστάντα ἐν αὐτῇ.*

[29] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 20. (v. 1. p. 328. sub fin. n. 70.) *Καὶ τὸ ἔθος καὶ τὸ πρέπον ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτεῖ πᾶσαν Κυριακὴν τιμᾷν, καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ πανηγυρίζειν, ἐπειδήπερ ἐν ταύτῃ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ἡμῖν ἐπρυτάνευσεν.*

[30] Ep. 28. [al. 71.] ad Lucin. Bætic. (t. 1. p. 432 e.) Utinam omni tempore jejunare possimus, quod in Actibus Apostolorum, diebus Pencostes et die Dominico Apostolum Paulum et cum eo credentes fecisse legimus.

[31] Ep. 21. ad Lucian. ap. Cyprian. p. 45. (p. 201.) Pro cujus factis ego in lætitia Paschæ flens die et nocte, in cilicio et cinere lacrymabundus dies exegi.

And all prayers offered in the standing posture on the Lord's-day in memory of our Saviour's resurrection.

6. Another custom, as generally prevailing, was always to pray standing, and never kneeling, on the Lord's-day, in memory also of our Saviour's resurrection. And we scarce meet with any exception to this, except it were in the case of penitents under public discipline, whom the canons[32] oblige to pray kneeling even upon days of relaxation. But setting aside this case, which only respected the penitents in their own particular prayers, the general custom was for all the faithful or communicants to pray standing. For which we have the concurrent testimony of Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, the Council of Nice, Hilary, Basil, Epiphanius, St. Jerom, St. Austin, Cassian, the Author of the Questions under the name of Justin Martyr, Martin Bracarensis, the Council of Trullo, and the Council of Tours in the time of Charles the Great. All which testimonies I have had occasion to recite at large once before[33], and therefore spare the repetition of them in this place; only observing from the two last of them, that this custom was not only general, but of long continuance in the Church; and when, or how it came to be altered or laid aside, I think is not very easy to determine.

The great care and concern of the primitive Christians in the religious observation of the Lord's-day. This demonstrated, first, from their constant attendance upon all the solemnities of public worship.

7. The last thing to be noted in this matter is the great care and concern of the primitive Christians for the religious observation of the Lord's-day: of which they have left us several demonstrations: first, in that they paid a ready and constant attendance upon all the offices and solemnities of public divine worship. They did not only rest from bodily labour and secular business, but spent the day in such employments as were proper to set forth the glory of the Lord, to whose honour the day was devoted: that is, in holding religious assemblies for the celebration of the several parts of divine service, psalmody, reading of the Scriptures, preaching, praying, and receiving the communion, all which were the constant service of this day: and such was the flaming zeal of those pious votaries, that nothing but sickness, or a great necessity, or imprisonment, or banishment, could detain them from it; and then also care was taken that the chief part of it, the communion, was

[32] C. Carth. 4. c. 82. (t. 2. p. 1206 c.) Pœnitentes etiam diebus remissionis genua flectant.

[33] B. 13. ch. 8. s. 3. v. 4. p. 499.

administered to them by the hands of the deacons, who carried it to those that were sick or in prison, that as far as was possible they might communicate still with the public congregation. This is plain from the account which Justin Martyr[34] gives of their worship: 'On the day called Sunday all that live in city or country meet together, and the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are read to them, after which the bishop or president of the assembly makes a discourse to the people, exhorting them to follow the good things they have heard: then we all rise, and make common prayer; and when prayers are ended, bread and wine and water are brought to the president, who prays and gives thanks with all possible fervency over them, the people answering, *Amen!* After which, distribution of the elements is made to all that are present, and they are sent to the absent by the hands of the deacons.' By this account it appears, that all Christians joined, as far as was possible, in the public service of the Lord's-day,—and particularly in receiving the communion, from which the absent were not exempt, if there was any possibility of their receiving it.

Secondly, From their zeal in frequenting religious assemblies even in times of persecution.

8. Neither was it any pretence of danger in times of difficulty and persecution that could abate their zeal for the public worship on the Lord's-day. For when they could not meet by day to serve God without hazard of their lives, they kept their nocturnal convocations, or morning assemblies for this purpose. Which is evident from the account which Pliny[35] gives of them, that they were used to meet before it was light on this solemn day, and sing their morning hymns to Christ. So Tertullian[36] in answer to one asking how they should celebrate the Lord's-

[34] Apol. 2. (p. 98 d.) Τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μενόντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν Προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Εἶτα, παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος, προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται. Ἔπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πέμπομεν· καὶ, παυσαμένων ἡμῶν τῆς εὐχῆς, ἄρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὕδωρ· καὶ ὁ προεστὼς εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ, ἀναπέμπει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπευφημεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν. Καὶ ἡ διάδοσις καὶ ἡ μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἑκάστῳ γίνεται, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσι διὰ τῶν διακόνων πέμπεται.

[35] L. 10. Ep. 97. See before, ch. 2. s. 1. p. 233. n. 41.

[36] De Fug. c. 14. (p. 543 b.)... Quomodo Dominica solemnia celebrabimus? Utique quomodo et Apostoli, fide, non pecunia tuti. Quæ fides si montem transferre potest, multo magis militem. ...Postremo si colligere interdiu non potes, habes noctem luce Christi luminosi adversus eam.

day solemnities for fear of the soldiers' coming in to discover them? replies, first, 'that they should do it as the Apostles did, by faith, and not by bribing them. For if faith could remove mountains, it would much more easily remove a soldier out of the way. But if they could not meet by day, they had the night sufficiently clear with the light of Christ to protect them.' The same author[37] tells the Heathen, who maliciously objected to them the murdering of an infant in their assemblies, 'that they were often beset, they were often betrayed, they were daily seized in their meetings and congregations: but no one ever found them acting such a tragedy, no one ever made evidence of their being such bloody Cyclopians and Sirens before a judge.' Nay, they were sometimes barbarously murdered in their assemblies, whilst the laws forbad their meetings under the name of *hetæriæ*[38], and denied them their *areæ*, or *places of worship*, as unlawful cabals, where they met only to plot treason and rebellion against the government. Under which pretence, Lactantius[39] and Eusebius[40] tell us, one of the Heathen judges burnt a whole city of people in Phrygia, together with their church, where they were met together to worship God. And the laws forbidding their assemblies are mentioned both by Pliny[41] and the Christian[42] writers.

[37] Apol. c. 7. (p. 8 a.) Quotidie obsidemur, quotidie prodimur, in ipsis plurimum cœtibus et congregationibus nostris opprimimur. Quis unquam taliter vagienti infanti supervenit? Quis cruenta, ut invenerat, Cyclopum et Sirenarum [al. Sirenum] ora judici reseravit?

[38] [Vid. Lexic. Forcellin. et Facciolat. (Patavii, 1828. t. 2. p. 543.) Hetæria .... *ἑταιρία*, sodalitas, collegium, societas. Apud Plin. 10. Epp. 43. et 97. in quibusdam codicibus legitur Græce scripta, in quibusdam Latine.—Plin. ut supr. Ep. 43. (p. 257.) .... Hetæriæ quamvis breves fient.—Ep. 97. (p. 278.) ... Post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetærias esse vetueram. —See nn. 41 and 42, following. Ed.]

[39] Institut. l. 5. c. 11. (t. 1. p. 390.) Aliqui ad occidendum præcipites exstiterunt, sicut unus in Phrygia, qui universum populum cum ipso pariter conventiculo concremavit.

[40] L. 8. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 390. 17.) *Ἤδη γοῦν ὅλην Χριστιανῶν πολίχνην αὔτανδρον ἀμφὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐν κύκλῳ περιβαλόντες ὁπλῖται, πῦρ τε ὑφάψαντες, κατέφλεξαν αὐτοὺς ἅμα νηπίοις καὶ γυναιξὶ τὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν Χριστὸν ἐπιβωμένους.*—[See also afterwards, ch. 4. s. 4., citing Nicephorus, l. 7. c. 6., and Baronius, An. 301. nn. 41—48., for a similar account. Ed.]

[41] L. 10. Ep. 97. (p. 278.) ..... Quibus peractis, morem sibi discedendi fuisse, rursusque coëundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium: quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum, quo secundum mandata tua hetærias esse vetueram.

[42] Tertul. ad Scap. c. 3. (p. 70 a.) ..... Doleamus necesse est, quod nulla civitas impune latura sit sanguinis nostri effusionem. Sicut et sub Hilariano præside, cum de areis

So that in these times of difficulty the Christians could not meet for divine worship, but at the hazard of their lives: and yet they did not think this a sufficient excuse to forsake the assembling of themselves together, but met continually to solemnize the Lord's-day in spite of all danger and opposition to the contrary.

Thirdly, From their studious observation of the vigils or nocturnal assemblies preceding the Lord's-day.

9. A further instance of their zeal was shown in the studious observation of the long vigils or nocturnal assemblies preceding the Lord's-day. For though these were first begun in times of persecution, yet they continued them as an useful exercise of piety when the persecutions were over: and the greatest personages did not refuse to frequent and encourage them, as Sidonius Apollinarius [43] particularly notes of Theodoric, king of the Goths, that he usually came with a small guard to the morning or antelucan assemblies of his party (for he was by sect an Arian): which he did to promote the cause of the Arians, who commonly vied in zeal with the Catholics in this service. And this made the Catholics, both clergy and laity, princes and people, express a more earnest concern for this particular way of introducing the great service of the Lord's-day, as I have had occasion more fully to demonstrate in a former Book [44]. All that I shall remark further here is, that though this morning service was very long, (for it commonly continued in psalmody, hymns and prayers from midnight till break of day), yet it was generally attended with great alacrity and assiduity by men of all ranks, who voluntarily resorted to it without any necessity or compulsion laid upon them. And this was another instance of their great zeal in the religious observation of the Lord's-day.

Fourthly, From their attendance upon sermons in many places twice on this day.

10. It is worth our remarking also, that in many places, especially in cities and churches of greater note, they had usually sermons twice on this day, and men resorted with diligence to the evening as well as to the morning sermon.

sepulturarum nostrarum acclamassent, *Areæ non sint!* areæ ipsorum non fuerunt; messes enim suas non egerunt, &c.—Euseb. l. 9. c. 2. (v. 1. p. 441. 30.) .... Πρῶτον μὲν εἴργειν ἡμᾶς τῆς ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις συνόδου διὰ προφάσεως πειρᾶται.

[43] L. 1. Ep. 2. (p. 6.) Antelucanos sacerdotum sacrorum cœtus minimo comitatu expetit: grandi sedulitate veneratur: quanquam, si sermo secretus, possis animo advertere, quod servet istam pro consuetudine potius, quam pro religione reverentiam.

[44] B. 13. ch. 9. s. 4. v. 4. p. 529. and ibid. ch. 10. s. 12, &c. pp. 567, seqq.

St. Chrysostom[45] sometimes commends the people of Antioch for their zeal in this matter. And there are several passages in St. Austin, St. Basil, Theodoret, and Gaudentius, which plainly refer to the same practice, of which I need say no more here, because I have more fully represented them in discoursing of the ancient manner of preaching[46] in another place.

Fifthly, From their attendance on evening prayers, where there was no sermon.

11. In such churches as had no evening sermon, there was still the common service of evening prayer: and men generally thought themselves obliged to attend this as a necessary part of the public worship and solemnity of the Lord's-day.

Some indeed in these primitive ages had their objections against this, which St. Chrysostom in one of his Homilies[47] mentions, and smartly answers. 'Why should we go to church,' said they, 'if we cannot hear a preacher?' 'This one thing,' says Chrysostom in his reply, 'has ruined and destroyed all religion. For what need is there of a preacher, except when that necessity arises from our sloth and negligence? What need is there of an homily, when all things necessary are plainly revealed in Scripture? Such hearers as desire to have something new every day only study to delight their ears and fancy. Tell me, what pompous train of words did St. Paul use? And yet he converted the world. What eloquent harangues did the illiterate Peter make? But the Scriptures are dark and hard to be understood, without a sermon to explain them. How so? Are they read in Hebrew, or Latin, or any other strange language? Are they not read in Greek to you

[45] Hom. 10. ad Pop. Antioch. t. 1. p. 132. See b. 14. ch. 4. s. 8. v. 5. p. 116. n. 55.

[46] B. 14. ch. 4. s. 8. v. 5. p. 114.

[47] Hom. 3. in 2 Thess. p. 1502. (t. 11. p. 528. b.) Τί εἰσέρχομαί, φησιν, εἰ οὐκ ἀκούω τινὸς ὁμιλοῦντος; Τοῦτο πάντα ἀπόλωλε καὶ διέφθειρε. Τίς γὰρ χρεία ὁμιλητοῦ; ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ῥαθυμίας αὕτη ἡ χρεία γέγονε· διὰ τὶ γὰρ ὁμιλίας χρεία; παντὰ σαφὴ καὶ εὐθέα τὰ παρὰ ταῖς θείαις Γραφαῖς· πάντα τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τέρψεώς ἐστε ἀκροαταὶ, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ταῦτα ζητεῖτε. Εἰπὲ γάρ μοι, ποίῳ κόμπῳ λόγου Παῦλος ἔλεγεν; ἀλλ' ὅμως τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπέστρεψε· ποίῳ δὲ Πέτρος ὁ ἀγράμματος; Ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδά, φησι, τὰ ἐν ταῖς θείαις Γραφαῖς κείμενα. Διὰ τί οὐκ οἶδας; μὴ γὰρ Ἑβραϊστί; μὴ γὰρ Ῥωμαϊστί; μὴ γὰρ ἑτερογλώσσως εἴρηται; οὐχὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ λέγεται; Ἀλλ' ἀσαφῶς, φησι. Ποῖον ἀσαφές; εἰπέ μοι· οὐχὶ ἱστορίαι εἰσι; τὰ γὰρ σαφῆ οἶδας, ἵνα περὶ τῶν ἀσαφῶν ἐρωτήσῃς. Μυρίαι ἱστορίαι εἰσὶν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς· εἰπέ μοι μίαν ἐξ ἐκείνων· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐρεῖς· πρόφασις ταῦτα καὶ λόγοι. Καθ' ἡμέραν, φησὶ, τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν ἀκούειν. Τί δὲ, εἰπέ μοι, ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ἀκούεις; ἐν ταῖς ἱπποδρομίαις οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ ὁρᾷς; τὰ δὲ πράγματα πάντα οὐ τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν; ὁ δὲ ἥλιος οὐχ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀεὶ ἀνατελλει; τροφαῖς δὲ οὐ ταῖς αὐταῖς χρώμεθα; ... πάντοθεν ῥαθυμίας καὶ σκήψεως τὰ ῥήματα.

that understand Greek? What difficulties do the histories contain? You may understand the plain places, and take some pains about the rest. O! but we have the same things read to us out of Scripture. And do you not hear the same things every day in the theatre? Have you not the same sight at the horse-race? Are not all things the same? Does not the same sun rise every morning? Do you not eat the same meat every day?' Hence he concludes, 'that all these were but pretences for idleness, or mere indications of a sceptical temper.' So again, when some would have excused themselves from these prayers of the church by this frivolous plea, 'that they could pray at home, but they could not hear a sermon in their own houses; and therefore they would come to sermon, but not to prayers:' he makes this handsome reply:[48] 'You deceive yourself, O man: for though you may pray at home, yet you cannot pray there in the same manner as you may in the church, where there are so many fathers together, and where the cry of your prayers is sent up to God with one consent. You are not heard so well, when you pray to God by yourself alone, as when you pray with your brethren. For there is something more here, consent of mind, and consent of voice, and the bond of charity, and the prayers of the priests together. For the priests for this very reason preside in the church, that the people's prayers, which are weaker of themselves, laying hold on those that are stronger, may together with them mount up to heaven.' In another place[49] answering the same vulgar plea, 'that men could pray at home,' he

[48] Hom. 3. de Incomprehensibili Dei Natura. t. 1. p. 363. (t. 1. p. 469 c.) *Εὔξασθαί φησι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας δύναμαι, ὁμιλίας δὲ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ διδασκαλίας οὐ δυνατὸν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας. Ἀπατᾷς σαυτὸν, ἄνθρωπε· εὔξασθαι μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας δυνατὸν, οὕτω δὲ εὔξασθαι, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀδύνατον, ὅπου πατέρων πλῆθος τοσοῦτον, ὅπου βοὴ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀναπέμπεται. Οὐχ οὕτως ἀκούῃ, κατὰ σαυτὸν τὸν δεσπότην παρακαλῶν, ὡς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν σῶν· ἐνταῦθα γάρ ἐστί τι πλέον, οἷον ἡ ὁμόνοια καὶ ἡ συμφωνία, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ὁ σύνδεσμος, καὶ αἱ τῶν ἱερέων εὐχαί· διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο οἱ ἱερεῖς προεστήκασιν, ἵνα καὶ αἱ τοῦ πλήθους εὐχαὶ ἀσθενέστεραι οὖσαι, τῶν δυνατωτέρων τούτων ἐπιλαβόμεναι, ὁμοῦ συνανέλθωσιν αὐταῖς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.*

[49] Hom. 2. de Obscurit. Prophetiar. t. 3. p. 946. (t. 6. p. 187 d.) *Δύνασαι μὲν εὔξασθαι* [scil. *ἐν οἰκίᾳ*], *οὐ τοσαύτην δὲ δύναμιν ἔχει ἡ εὐχὴ, ὡς ὅταν μετὰ τῶν μελῶν τῶν οἰκείων γίνηται, ὡς ὅταν ὁλόκληρον τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἀναπέμπῃ τὴν δέησιν μιᾷ φωνῇ, ἱερέων παρόντων καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς τοῦ κοινοῦ πλήθους ἀναφερόντων.*

tells them, 'You may pray at home indeed, but your prayers are not of that efficacy and power, as when the whole body of the Church, with one mind and one voice, send up their prayers together; the priests assisting, and offering up the prayers of the whole multitude in common.'

This was the sense which that holy man had of public prayer on the Lord's-day, though there was no sermon; and the method he took to show men their obligation to frequent the church for public prayer, which, when men had opportunity to frequent it, was always to be preferred before private devotion. They might both very well consist together, and both be performed as proper exercises for the Lord's-day: but the one was not to justle out the other, or to be pleaded as a rational excuse for absenting from the public service.

He that would see this matter more fully stated, may look back to the discourse of Church-unity [50], where men's obligation to preserve the unity of worship, in joining with the Church in prayers, and administration of the word and sacraments, has been amply considered.

Sixthly, From the censures inflicted on those who violated the laws concerning the religious observation of the Lord's-day.

12. I shall but mention one instance more of their great zeal and concern for the religious observation of the Lord's-day, and that is the Church's care in making many good laws of discipline, for the censure and punishment of those, who in any considerable degree violated the just observation of it. If any one absented for three Lord's-days from the public assembly of the church, without any just reason or necessity to compel him, this was an offence thought worthy of excommunication: as may be seen in the canons of the Councils of Eliberis [51], and Sardica [52], and Trullo [53]. 'If any one went to the public games in the theatre or the circus on this day, he was liable to excommunication also for a single offence after a first admonition' as appears from the Council of Carthage [54] and the denunciations of St. Chrysostom [55]. If any one left the church whilst

[50] B. 16. ch. 1. s. 5. v. 6. p. 18.

[51] C. 21. (t. 1. p. 973 b.) Si quis in civitate positus tres Dominicas ad ecclesiam non accesserit, pauco [al. tanto] tempore abstineat, ut correptus esse videatur.

[52] C. 11. See before, b. 16. ch. 1. s. 5. v. 6. p. 21. n. 49.

[53] C. 80. See ibid. n. 50.

[54] Carth. 4. c. 88. (t. 2. p. 1206 e.) Qui die solemni, prætermisso solemni [die] ecclesiæ conventu, ad spectacula vadit, excommunicetur.

[55] Hom. 6. in Gen. t. 2. p. 53. See s. 4. p. 252. n. 5.

the bishop was preaching, by a rule of the fourth Council of Carthage[56], he was liable to the same condemnation and censure. If any one came to church to hear the Scriptures read and the sermon preached, but refused to join in prayers or the reception of the communion, which in those times was administered to all in general every Lord's-day, he was to be excommunicated for his offence, and reduced to the state of a penitent, as one who brought confusion and disorder into the Church. This we learn from the Apostolical Canons[57], and the Councils of Antioch[58], Eliberis[59], and Toledo[60]. If any one held a separate assembly, or frequented or encouraged any such, he was to be treated as an heretic or schismatic, for despising the service of the Lord's-day. The Apostolical Canons[61] excommunicate all such, and the Council of Gangra[62] lays the heaviest censure of *anathema* upon them. If any one perversely chose to make the Lord's-day a day of fasting; because this was contrary to the general rule and practice of the Church, and gave suspicion of some heresy denying the resurrection of the Lord; the Apostolical Canons[63], and the Council of Gangra[64]; and the fourth Council of Carthage[65], and the first of Braga[66] peremptorily denounce such an one excommunicate, and anathema, and no Catholic, as herding with the impious Manichees, Marcionites, Priscillianists, and such other heretics, as purposely chose to fast on the Lord's-day, to show despite to the doctrine of our Saviour's humanity and resurrection.

I have discoursed these things at large in giving an account of the unity and discipline of the Church in a former Book[67],

[56] C. 24. (t. 2. p. 1202 a.) Sacerdote verbum faciente in ecclesia, qui egressus de auditorio fuerit, excommunicetur.

[57] C. 7. See before, b. 16. ch. 1. s. 5. v. 6. p. 21. n. 45.

[58] C. 2. See before, ibid. n. 46.

[59] C. 28. See before, ibid. n. 47.

[60] C. 13. (t. 2. p. 1225 d.) De his, qui intrant in ecclesiam, et deprehenduntur nunquam communicare, admoneantur, &c.—Conf. ibid. c. 14.

[61] C. 30. al. 32. See as above, v. 6. p. 20. n. 44.

[62] C. 5. (t. 2. p. 419 a.) Εἴ τις διδάσκοι, τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐκαταφρόνητον εἶναι, καὶ τὰς ἐν αὐτῷ συνάξεις, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.—C. 6. (ibid. a.) Εἴ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάζοι, καὶ, καταφρονῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐθέλοι πράττειν, μὴ συνόντος τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[63] C. 64. See before, s. 5. n. 18, preceding.

[64] C. 18. See the same, n. 19, preceding.

[65] C. 64. See the same, n. 16.

[66] C. 4. See the same, n. 17.

[67] B. 16. ch. 1. s. 5. and ch. 8. s. 2. v. 6. pp. 18 and 369.

and therefore only just touch them here, to show with what zeal and concern the Ancients laboured to establish the observation of the Lord's-day, which they esteemed the queen and empress of all days, in which our life was raised again, and death conquered by our Lord and Saviour; as the author of the Epistle to the Magnesians under the name of Ignatius[68] words it, who in this speaks the language of the Ancients[69], who often style this day *the queen of days*, as Buxtorf[70] observes the Rabbins were used to term the Jewish Sabbath *malchah*, that is, *the queen of days* from whom the Christian took the name, and transferred it to the Lord's-day, which is the proper Christian Sabbath.

CHAP. III.

Of the observation of the Sabbath or Saturday as a weekly festival.

ıtur- Sab- lways ed in ıstern h as a l.

1. Next to the Lord's-day the ancient Christians were very careful in the observation of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was the ancient Jewish Sabbath. Some observed it as a fast, others as a festival, but all unanimously agreed in keeping it as a more solemn day of religious worship and adoration. In the Eastern Church it was ever observed as a festival, one only Sabbath excepted, which was called *the great Sabbath*, between Good-Friday and Easter-day, when our Saviour lay buried in the grave, upon which account it was kept as a fast throughout the whole Church. But setting aside that one Sabbath, all the rest were kept as festivals in the Oriental Church. St. Austin, though he lived in a country where it was kept a fast, yet testifies for the contrary practice of the Eastern Church.

[68] N. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 59.).. Καὶ μετὰ τὸ σαββατίσαι, ἑορταζέτω πᾶς φιλόχριστος τὴν Κυριακὴν, τὴν ἀναστάσιμον, τὴν βασιλίδα, τὴν ὕπατον πασῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν, . . . ἐν ᾗ καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν ἀνέτειλε, καὶ τοῦ θανάτου γέγονε νίκη ἐν Χριστῷ.

[69] Orat. 43. in Dominic. Nov. (t. 1. p. 703 b.) Ἡ βασίλισσα τῶν ὡρῶν τῇ βασιλίδι τῶν ἡμερῶν πομπεύει. *Regina temporum reginæ dierum pompam peragit.*

[70] Synagog. Judaic. c. 10. (p. 246.) Rabbini etiam Sabbatum *malchah* sive *reginam* nominarunt. Jam si quis vestes regales, ante reginam illam compariturus, non indueret; quales alias causa regum honorandorum quilibet induere soleret; per id regina talis dedecore magno afficeretur.—[This citation is according to the Hanover edition of 1622, 8vo. The sentiments, with a slight variation of language, occur in cap. 15. p. 298 lin. ult., according to the Ed. Basil. 1661, 8vo. Ed.]

For writing to St. Jerom[71], he asks him, Whether he thought an Oriental Christian, when he came to Rome, might not without any dissimulation fast on every Sabbath, as well as that one Sabbath called *the Paschal vigil?* 'If we say it is a sin to fast on the Sabbath, we shall condemn not only the Roman Church, but many neighbouring Churches, and some at a greater distance, where that custom is kept and retained. But if we think it is a sin not to fast on the Sabbath, we shall rashly condemn all the Oriental Churches, and the greatest part of the Christian world. We should therefore rather say, it is a thing indifferent in itself, which a good man may perform either way without dissimulation, complying with the society and observation of the Church where he happens to be.' From hence it is plain, that all the Oriental Churches, and the greatest part of the world observed the Sabbath as a festival.

The Greek writers are unanimous in their testimony. The author of the Constitutions, who describes the customs chiefly of the Oriental Church, frequently[72] speaks of it. 'On the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, on which Christ rose from the dead, ye shall more carefully meet together, to praise God, who created all things by Jesus, to hear the Prophets and Gospel read, to offer the oblation, and partake of the Holy Supper.' In another place[73] he says, 'Christ commanded

[71] Ep. 19. p. 29. [al. Ep. 82. c. 2.] (t. 2. p. 194 e.) Vellem me doceret benigna sinceritas tua, utrum simulate quisquam sanctus Orientalis, cum Romam venerit, jejunet Sabbato, excepto illo die Paschalis vigiliæ? Quod si malum esse dixerimus, non solum Romanam ecclesiam, sed etiam multo ei vicina, et aliquanto remotiora condemnabimus, ubi mos idem tenetur et manet. Si autem non jejunare Sabbato malum putaverimus tot ecclesias Orientis, multo majorem orbis Christiani partem qua temeritate criminabimur? Placetne tibi, ut medium quiddam esse dicamus quod tamen acceptabile sit ei, qui hoc non simulate, sed congruenti societate atque observantia fuerit.

[72] L. 2. c. 59. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 268.) ....Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ Σαββάτου καὶ ἐν τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναστασίμῳ, τῇ Κυριακῇ, σπουδαιοτέρως ἀπαντᾶτε, αἶνον ἀναπέμποντες τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ ποιήσαντι τὰ ὅλα διὰ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐξαποστείλαντι καὶ συγχωρήσαντι παθεῖν, καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήσαντι. Ἐπεὶ τί ἀπολογήσεται τῷ Θεῷ, ὁ μὴ συνερχόμενος ἐν τῇδε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀκούειν τοῦ σωτηρίου περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως λόγου; ἐν ᾗ καὶ τρὶς Εὐχὰς ἑστῶτες ἐπιτελοῦμεν, μνήμης χάριν τοῦ διὰ τριῶν ἀναστάντος ἡμερῶν· ἐν ᾗ Προφητῶν ἀνάγνωσις, καὶ Εὐαγγελίου κηρυκία, καὶ θυσίας ἀναφορὰ, καὶ τροφῆς ἱερᾶς δωρεά.

[73] L. 5. c. 15. [al. 14.] (ibid. p. 319.) Παρήγγειλεν οὖν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς ...αὐτὸ νηστεῦσαι τὸ Σάββατον, οὐχ ὅτι δεῖ τὸ Σάββατον νηστεύειν, κατάπαυσιν δημιουργίας ὑπάρχον, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνο μόνον χρὴ νηστεύειν, τοῦ δημιουργοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔτι ὑπὸ γῆν ὄντος.

them to fast on the Sabbath before Easter: not that they were to fast on the Sabbath, on which God rested from the creation, but only on that one Sabbath, when the Creator of the world lay under the earth.' And again[74]: 'On every Sabbath except one, and the Lord's-day, ye shall hold festival assemblies.' 'The Sabbath[75] and the Lord's-day ye shall observe as festivals, because the one is a remembrance of the creation, and the other of the resurrection. But one Sabbath in the year, viz. that on which our Lord lay buried in the grave, ye shall keep as a fast and not a festival. For whilst the Creator lay under the earth, mourning was more becoming upon his account, than joy for the creation: because the Creator in nature and dignity is more honourable than all his creatures.' Finally[76], he represents it as the order of the Apostles Peter and Paul, 'that servants should work five days in the week, but on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day they should rest, that they might have liberty to go to church for instruction in piety; on the Sabbath, in regard to the creation; on the Lord's-day in regard to the resurrection.' Athanasius[77] likewise tells us, that they held religious assemblies on the Sabbath, 'not because they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus the Lord of the Sabbath.' Epiphanius[78] says the same, 'that it was a day of public assembly in many Churches,' meaning the Oriental Churches, where it was kept a festival.

2. Other authors are more particular in describing the religious service of this day: and so far as concerns public worship, they make it in all things conformable to that of the

[74] C. 20. [al. 19.] (ibid. p. 327.) Πᾶν μέν τοι Σάββατον, ἄνευ τοῦ ἑνὸς, καὶ πᾶσαν Κυριακὴν, ἐπιτελοῦντες συνόδους, εὐφραίνεσθε.

[75] L. 7. c. 23. [al. 24.] (ibid. p. 369.) Τὸ Σάββατον μέν τοι καὶ τὴν Κυριακὴν ἑορτάζετε, ὅτι τὸ μὲν, δημιουργίας ἐστὶν ὑπόμνημα, ἡ δὲ, ἀναστάσεως. Ἓν δὲ μόνον Σάββατον ὑμῖν φυλακτέον ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ, τὸ τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου ταφῆς, ὅπερ νηστεύειν προσῆκεν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἑορτάζειν· ἐν ὅσῳ γὰρ ὁ δημιουργὸς ὑπὸ γῆν τυγχάνει, ἰσχυρότερον τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ πένθος, τῆς κατὰ τὴν δημιουργίαν χαρᾶς· ὅτι ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν αὐτοῦ δημιουργημάτων φύσει τε καὶ ἀξίᾳ τιμιώτερος.

[76] L. 8. c. 33. (ibid. p. 414.) Ἐγὼ Παῦλος καὶ ἐγὼ Πέτρος διατασσόμεθα· ἐργαζέσθωσαν οἱ δοῦλοι πέντε ἡμέρας· Σάββατον δὲ καὶ Κυριακὴν σχολαζέτωσαν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, διὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς εὐσεβείας· τὸ μὲν γὰρ Σάββατον εἴπομεν, δημιουργίας λόγον ἔχειν, τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν ἀναστάσεως.

[77] Hom. de Sement. t. 1. p. 1060. (t. 9. p. 45 d.) Ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Σαββάτου συνήχθημεν οὐ νοσοῦντες Ἰουδαϊσμόν· .... παραγεγόναμεν δὲ ἐν Σαββάτῳ τὸν Κύριον τοῦ Σαββάτου Ἰησοῦν προσκυνήσοντες.

[78] Expos. Fid. n. 24. (t. 1. p. 1107 c.) Ἔν τισι δὲ τόποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Σάββασι συνάξεις ἐπιτελοῦσιν.

Lord's-day: which is a further evidence of its being a festival. They tell us, they had not only the Scriptures read, as on the Lord's-day, and sermons preached, but the communion administered also. Which is expressly said by Socrates[79], and Cassian[80], and St. Basil[81], and Timothy of Alexandria[82], and St. Austin[83], and the Council of Laodicea[84]; which Council particularly forbids 'the offering of the eucharistical oblation, or solemnizing any memorials of martyrs on any other days in Lent, beside the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, because all other days were days of fasting, but these even in Lent were kept as festivals and days of relaxation.' I have once before had occasion to produce the testimonies of these several writers at large[85], and therefore it is sufficient here to make a short reference to them, to show the ancient manner of keeping the Sabbath-festival in the Oriental Church.

lemnities as the Lord's-day.

3. Only here we are to observe, that though the substance of the service for the Sabbath and the Lord's-day was the same, yet in rites and ceremonies a difference was made, and in some other respects the preference was given to the Lord's-day above the Sabbath. For, first, we find no ecclesiastical

But in some other respects the preference was given to the Lord's-day.

[79] L. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 295. 21.) Τῶν γὰρ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ Σαββάτων κατὰ πᾶσαν ἑβδομάδος περιόδον ἐπιτελοῦσι τὰ μυστήρια, κ. τ. λ.—It. l. 6. c. 8. (ibid. p. 321. 38.) Ἡνίκα οὖν ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος ἑορταὶ κατελάμβανον, φημὶ δὴ τό τε Σάββατον καὶ ἡ Κυριακὴ, κ. τ. λ.

[80] Instit. l. 3. c. 2. (p. 30.)...Die Sabbati.... communionis obtentu conveniunt.

[81] Ep. 289. [al. 93.] ad Cæsar. Patric. (t. 3. part 1. p. 267 d.).... Καὶ τῷ Σαββάτῳ, κ. τ. λ.

[82] C. 13. (ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 2. part 1. p. 168 e.) See before b. 13. ch. 9. s. 3. v. 4. p. 527. n. 21. [Conf. Matth. Blastar. Syntagm. Lit. T. c. 18. (ibid. part 2. p. 83 a.) Canon autem 5. et 13. Timothei Alexandrinæ viros et mulieres qui nocte carnaliter conjuncti sunt, interdiu, dum sacra synaxis celebratur, a sacris mysteriis arcet..... præcipuo autem Sabbato... et die Dominico, a mutuo commercio abstinendum est, utpote quod tum sacra oblatio Domino offeratur. Ed.]

[83] Ep. 118. [al. 54. c. 2.] (t. 2. p. 124 d.)...Alibi Sabbato tantum et Dominico, &c.

[84] Cc. 49 et 51. (t. 1. p. 1505 a, et b.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ τῇ Τεσσαρακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν εἰ μὴ ἐν Σάββατῳ καὶ Κυριακῇ μόνον.—Conf. Cassian. Instit. l. 5. c. 26. (p. 95.) Vidimus alium in solitudine commorantem, qui nunquam se sibi soli indulsisse cibum testatus est, sed etiam si per totos quinque dies ad ejus cellulam nullus e fratribus advenisset, refectionem jugiter distulisse, donec Sabbato vel Dominico die, devotæ congregationis obtentu procedens ad ecclesiam, peregrinorum quempiam reperisset, quem exinde reducens ad cellulam, consorte eo refectionem corporis.... assumeret.—Aster. Amasen. Hom. 5. ap. Combefis. Auctar. Nov. (p. 77.) Καλὴ συνωρὶς τῶν δύο τούτων ἡμερῶν τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς καὶ φιλοπόνοις τυγχάνει, τοῦ Σαββάτου καὶ τῆς Κυριακῆς λέγω, κ. τ. λ.

[85] B. 13. ch. 9. s. 3. v. 4. p. 527. nn. 20, seqq.

laws obliging men to pray standing on the Sabbath. For that was a ceremony peculiar to the Lord's-day in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. Nor, secondly, are there any imperial laws forbidding lawsuits and pleadings on this day. Nor, thirdly, any laws prohibiting the public shows and games, as on the Lord's-day. Nor, fourthly, any laws obliging men to abstain wholly from bodily labour. But on the contrary, the Council of Laodicea has a canon[86] forbidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the Sabbath, any further than was necessary for public worship: but they were to honour the Lord's-day, and rest on it as Christians. And if any were found to Judaize, an *anathema* is pronounced against them. The like direction is given by the author of the Epistle to the Magnesians[87] in conformity to this rule: 'Let us not keep the Sabbath after the Jewish manner, rejoicing in idleness: "For he that will not work, neither let him eat:" and "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread," say the Divine Oracles. But let every one of you keep the Sabbath spiritually, rejoicing in the meditation of the Law, not in the rest of the body; admiring the workmanship of God, not eating things dressed the day before, nor drinking lukewarm drink, nor walking within a certain space, the limits of a Sabbath-day's journey, nor taking pleasure in dancing and shouting, which things have no sense or reason in them.' Here are several superstitions and vanities in the Jewish observation of the Sabbath reflected on by this author, but I only note the opposition he makes between the Christian and Jewish way of observing the Sabbath in point of working. The Jews abstained wholly from working on the Sabbath; the Christians only so far as was necessary for their attendance upon divine service in the church. And in this sense, I think, we are to 'understand the author of the Constitutions, when he says[88], 'Let servants work five days in the week, but on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day let them rest in

[86] C. 29. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 247. n. 84.

[87] N. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 59.) Μηκέτι οὖν σαββατίζωμεν Ἰουδαϊκῶς, καὶ ἀργίαις χαίροντες. Ὁ μὴ ἐργαζόμενος γὰρ, μὴ ἐσθιέτω. Ἐν ἱδρῶτι γὰρ τοῦ προσώπου σου φάγῃ τὸν ἄρτον σου, φασὶ τὰ Λόγια. Ἀλλ' ἕκαστος ὑμῶν σαββατιζέτω πνευματικῶς, μελέτῃ νόμου χαίρων, οὐ σώματος ἀνέσει, δημιουργίαν Θεοῦ θαυμάζων, οὐκ ἕωλα ἐσθίων, καὶ χλιαρὰ πίνων, καὶ μεμετρημένα βαδίζων, καὶ ὀρχήσει καὶ κρότοις νοῦν οὐκ ἔχουσι χαίρων.

[88] L. 8. c. 33. See before, n. 76, preceding.

the Church for their instruction in piety.' But if any think, with Cotelerius, that he extends the rest of the Sabbath as far as that of the Lord's-day, because he joins them both together; I will not contend about it, but only say, he then contradicts the Laodicean fathers, who plainly forbid a total rest upon the Sabbath, to give some preference in this respect to the Lord's-day, which was of greater esteem in the Christian Church.

Why the ancient Church continued the observation of the Jewish Sabbath.

4. If it be inquired why the ancient Church continued the observation of the Jewish Sabbath, when they took it to be only a temporary institution given to the Jews only, as circumcision and other typical rites of the Law: (which is expressly said by many of the ancient writers, particularly by Justin Martyr[89], Irenæus[90], Tertullian[91], Eusebius[92], to name no more:) it is answered by learned men[93], 'that it was to comply with the Jewish converts, as they did in the use of many other indifferent things, so long as no doctrinal necessity was laid upon them. For the Jews being generally the first converts to the Christian faith, they still retained a mighty reverence for the Mosaic institutions, and especially for the Sabbath, as that which had been appointed by God himself, as the memorial of his rest from the work of creation, settled by their great master Moses, and celebrated by their ancestors for so many ages, as the solemn day of their public worship, and were therefore very loath it should be wholly antiquated and laid aside. For this reason it seemed good to the prudence of those times, as in other of the Jewish rites, so in this, to indulge the humour of that people, and to keep the Sabbath as a day for religious offices, viz. public prayers, reading of the Scrip-

[89] Dialog. cum Tryph. (pp. 245, 246. et passim.)

[90] L. 4. c. 30. (p. 319. 30.) Quia non per hæc justificabatur homo, sed in signo data sunt populo, ostendit, quod ipse Abraham sine circumcisione et sine observatione Sabbatorum credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam et amicus Dei vocatus est.

[91] Cont. Jud. c. 4. (p. 186 d.) Sequitur itaque ut quatenus circumcisionis carnalis, et legis veteris abolitio expuncta suis temporibus demonstratur, ita Sabbati quoque observatio temporaria fuisse demonstretur.

[92] L. 1. c. 4. (v. 1. p. 15, 38.) Οὔτε σώματος αὐτοῖς περιτομῆς ἔμελλεν, ὅτι μὴ δὲ ἡμῖν· οὐ Σαββάτων ἐπιτηρήσεως, ὅτι μὴ δὲ ἡμῖν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν τοιῶνδε τροφῶν παραφυλακῆς, οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων διαστολῆς, ὅσα τοῖς μετέπειτα πρῶτος ἁπάντων Μωϋσῆς ἀρξάμενος ἐν συμβόλοις τελεῖσθαι παραδέδωκεν, ὅτι μὴ δὲ νῦν Χριστιανῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα.

[93] Cave, Primitive Christianity, b. 1. ch. 7. p. 174. (p. 83.) They [the Jews] being generally the first converts, &c.

tures, preaching, celebration of the sacraments and such like duties.' But when any one pretended to carry the observation of it further, either by introducing a doctrinal necessity, or pressing the observation of it precisely after the Jewish manner, they resolutely opposed it, as introducing Judaism into the Christian religion. For this reason the Ebionites were condemned for joining the observation of the Sabbath[94], according to the law of the Jews, with the observation of the Lord's-day after the manner of Christians. Against such the Council of Laodicea[95] pronounces *anathema*, that is, such as taught the necessity of keeping the Sabbath a perfect rest with the Jews. And in this sense we are to understand what Gregory the Great says[96], 'that Antichrist will renew the observation of the Sabbath.' He must needs mean the observation of it after the Jewish manner: since in the Christian way it was observed as well by the Latin Church as the Greek; only with this difference, that the Latins kept it a fast, and the Greeks a festival.

Why it was kept as a festival in the Oriental Church.

5. If it be inquired what was the occasion of this difference, why the Greek Church observed it as a festival, and the Latin as a fast? I answer, the Greek Church received it as they found it delivered to them by the Jews, among whom it was always a festival. But besides this there was another reason inclining them to do it. For Marcion the heretic made it a part of his heresy to fast on the Sabbath, in opposition to the God of the Jews, pretending that there was another god to be worshipped beside the Creator of the world, who was the God of the Jews; and therefore he appointed the Sabbath to be kept a fast, that he might not seem to comply with the rites of the God of the Jews, who rested from his work of creation on the Sabbath, or seventh day. This is expressly said by Epiphanius[97]: 'Marcion for this reason fasted on the Sabbath:

[94] Vid. Theodoret. Hæret. Fab. l. 2. c. 1. (t. 4. part 1. p. 328.) Τὸ μὲν Σάββατον κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαίων τιμῶσι νόμον, τὴν δὲ Κυριακὴν καθιεροῦσι παραπλησίως ἡμῖν.

[95] C. 29. See before, ch. 2. s. 3. p. 247. n. 84.

[96] L. 11. Ep. 3. Antichristum renovaturum Sabbati observantiam. (CC. t. 5. p. 1511 b.).. Qui veniens diem Sabbatum atque Dominicum ab omni faciet opere custodiri.

[97] Hær. 42. Marcion. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 304 b.) Τὸ δὲ Σάββατον νηστεύει διὰ τοιαύτην αἰτίαν· ἐπειδή, φησι, τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνάπαυσις τοῦ πεποιηκότος τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναπαυσαμένου, ἡμεῖς νηστεύσωμεν ταύτην, ἵνα μὴ τὸ καθῆκον τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐργαζώμεθα.

for, said he, since that day is the rest of the God of the Jews, who made the world, and rested on the Sabbath-day, we therefore fast on that day, that we may not do any thing in compliance with the God of the Jews.' Now this made the Catholics more zealous to keep the Sabbath a festival, that they might not seem to give any countenance to the wicked blasphemy and impiety of Marcion, or any ways reflect upon the God of the Old Testament, whom they owned and honoured as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which Marcion did not: since he in spite to the true God made the Sabbath a fast, they thought it proper to keep it a festival as it had always been from its first institution. And in opposition to his heresy, soon after it began to spread, a canon was made in the Church, which now we have among those called the Apostolical Canons[98]. 'that if any clergyman was found to fast on the Lord's-day, or on the Sabbath, one only excepted, he should be deposed; or, if he was a layman, be cast out of the communion of the Church.'

After Marcion, there arose many other sects, who followed him in this particular singularity of keeping the Sabbath as a fast, though they did not all agree in the same reasons for doing it. The Eustathians did it for the exercise of an ascetic life; and the Massalians or Euchites on the same pretence: yet the Church would not allow them in their practice. The Marcianists, who were a distinct sect from the Marcionites: for they were so called from one Marcianus Trapezita in the time of Justinian, kept the Sabbath also a fast. So did also the Sabbatians, Lampetians, Choreutæ, and Adelphians, who are condemned by Maximus[99], and Anastasius[1], and Timotheus of Constantinople[2], and Nicephorus Patriarcha[3], whose testimonies,

[98] C. 64. al. 66. See before, ch. 2. s. 5. p. 225. n. 18.

[99] In Dionys. de Eccles. Hierarch. c. 6. (t. 2. p. 83 c. 6.) Σημείωσαι κατὰ Λαμπετιανῶν, ἤτοι Μεσσαλιανῶν ἢ Ἀδελφιανῶν, ταὐτὸν δὲ εἰπεῖν Μαρκιανιστῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[1] [Sinaïta] Quæst. 64. (p. 424.) Ὡς καί τινες πάλιν τῶν Εὐσταθιανῶν νηστεύουσι Τεσσαρακοστὴν ἐν Σαββάτῳ καὶ Κυριακῇ· κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τῶν λεγομένων Εὐσταθιανῶν, καὶ Μαρκιανιστῶν, καὶ Λαμπετιανῶν, καὶ Μασσαλιανῶν, τῶν ἐν Παφλαγονίᾳ ποτὲ ἀναφέντων. — [Vid. etiam Latine ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 1014 a. 4. Ed.]

[2] De iis qui ad fidem Catholicam accedunt. (ap. Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 15. Cotel. t. 1. p. 319. n. 47.) Μαρκιανισταὶ, οἱ ἀπὸ Μαρκιανοῦ τοῦ Τραπεζίτου, καὶ Μεσσαλιανοὶ, καὶ Εὐτυχίται [malim Εὐχίται] καὶ Ἐνθουσιασταὶ, καὶ Χορευταὶ, καὶ Λαμπετιανοὶ, καὶ Ἀδελφιανοὶ, καὶ Εὐσταθιανοί. —In Apparatu Sacro Possevini: ... Exemplari autem Regio 2336, &c.

collected and corrected out of manuscripts, the curious reader may find at large in Cotelerius[4] and Combefis[5]. I only observe, that the Council of Trullo, which was held anno 692, or 707, censures the Roman Church itself for fasting on this day, and orders them to correct their practice. The words of the canon[6] are remarkable: 'Forasmuch as we understand that in the city of Rome the Sabbath in Lent is kept as a fast, contrary to the rule and custom of the Church: it seemed good to the holy synod that in the Roman Church also the ancient canon should be revived and enforced, which says, If any clergyman be found to fast on the Lord's-day, or on the Sabbath, one only excepted, let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be excommunicated.' From whence we may observe, that this custom of celebrating the Sabbath as a festival was constantly and inviolably maintained in the Greek Church without any variation.

And why a fast in the Roman and some other of the Latin Churches.

6. And there are some learned men of the Roman communion who think it was so originally in the Latin Church also. Albaspinæus[7] is so clearly of this opinion, that he thinks the Church of Rome herself at first observed the Sabbath as a festival. And it appears plainly from Tertullian, who, writing against the Orthodox in favour of the Montanists, says expressly that both the Catholics and the Montanists excepted the Sabbath out of their fasts. 'The Catholics,' he says[8], 'kept no Sabbath a fast, except the great Sabbath before

Μαρκιανισταὶ, κ. τ. λ., where the reading differs. (See Cotel. ibid.)

[3] Antirrhetic. (Cotel. ibid. p. 320. n. 47.) Ἐκ τῆς συγγραφῆς Τιμοθέου πρεσβυτέρου τῆς κατὰ Μαρκιανιστῶν, ἤτοι Ἀκεφάλων· καθ' ὧν ἠγωνίσατο Κύριλλος Ἀλεξανδρείας, Φλαβιανὸς, καὶ Θεόδοτος Ἀντιοχείας, κ. τ. λ.

[4] In Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 319. n. 47.)

[5] Hist. Monothelit. (Auctar. Nov. t. 2. p. 461. Notar.) Cum nonnullorum exemplarium, &c.

[6] C. 55. al. 56. (t. 6. p. 1167 d.) Ἐπειδὴ μεμαθήκαμεν, ἐν τῇ Ῥωμαίων πόλει ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις Τεσσαρακοστῆς νηστείαις τοῖς ταύτης Σάββασι νηστεύειν, παρὰ τὴν παραδοθεῖσαν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ακολουθίαν, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ, ὥστε κρατεῖν καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπαρασαλεύτως τὸν κανόνα τὸν λέγοντα· Εἴ τις κληρικὸς εὑρεθείη τῇ ἁγίᾳ Κυριακῇ νηστεύων ἢ τὸ Σάββατον, πλὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου, καθαιρείσθω· εἰ δὲ λαϊκὸς, ἀφοριζέσθω.

[7] Observat. l. 1. c. 13. (ad calc. Optat. p. 27 a.) Quod ad Sabbata attinet, Græci et Orientales eandem pene rationem secuti sunt. Nam, ut ex antiquioribus auctoribus constat, festa celebritate colebatur, jejuniumque interdicebatur. Latinorum autem varius in ea re usus fuit. Ea enim alias perinde ac Græci celebrarunt, sed sensim inductus est mos, ut jejunaretur, et tristitiæ dies haberentur.

[8] De Jejun. c. 14. (p. 552 b.) ... Quanquam vos etiam Sabbatum, si quando continuatis, nunquam nisi in Pascha jejunandum, secundum rationem alibi redditam.

Easter.' And the Montanists, who observed twice in the year two weeks of *xerophagiæ*, or *fasts upon dry meats only*[9], yet never fasted in them either on the Sabbath or the Lord's-day. So that it is next to impossible that the Sabbath should have been a fast in the Roman Church at this time, and yet not have been discerned by so acute a man as Tertullian, when it was so much for his cause in this dispute to have taken notice of it. However it is certain that not long after in the Roman and some other of the Latin Churches, a change was made: but then the very manner of the change sufficiently discovers the novelty of it. The Council of Eliberis[10], which first introduced the Saturday-fast into Spain, plainly intimates that it was not observed there before, till they first introduced it, and that most probably from the example of the Roman Church, where it had been settled a little before. St. Austin[11] long after this observes, that only the Roman and some of the Western Churches, not all of them, kept the Sabbath a fast; and he notes[12] more particularly how in Afric they were divided in their practice: for in the Churches of the same province, and sometimes among the people of the same Church, it was very common for some to dine, and some to fast on the Sabbath. But at Milan, which was a much nearer neighbour to Rome, the ancient custom still continued of keeping Saturday always a festival. So that even in Lent, as St. Ambrose[13] himself assures us, not only the Lord's-day, but every Sabbath, except the great Sabbath before Easter, were observed as festivals and days of relaxation. And for this reason, as the au-

[9] C. 15. (ibid. c.).. Duas in anno hebdomadas xerophagiarum, nec totas, exceptis scilicet Sabbatis et Dominicis, offerimus Deo.

[10] C. 26. (t. 1. p. 973 d.) Errorem placuit corrigi, ut omni Sabbati die [jejuniorum] superpositionem celebremus. — Albaspin. in loc. (ibid. p. 995 b.) *Superpositiones*, id est, imponere jejunia, quæ solita non essent observari. — Vid. C. Agathens. c. 12. (t. 4. p. 1385 d.) Placuit ut omnes ecclesiæ filii, exceptis diebus Dominicis in Quadragesima, etiam die Sabbato, sacerdotali ordinatione et distinctionis comminatione jejunent.

[11] Ep. 86. [al. 36.] ad Casulan. c. 13. (t. 2. p. 80 f.) Hinc exorta est ista in reginæ illius veste varietas, ut alii, sicut maxime populi Orientis, propter requiem significandam mallent relaxare jejunium: alii propter humilitatem mortis Domini jejunare [mallent] sicut Romana et nonnullæ Occidentis ecclesiæ.

[12] Ibid. [c. 14.] p. 149. (p. 81 e.) .... Contingit maxime in Africa, ut una ecclesia, vel unius regionis ecclesiæ, alios habeant Sabbato prandentes, alios jejunantes.

[13] De Elia et Jejun. c. 10. See before, ch. 2. s. 5. p. 254. n. 12.

thor of his Life tells us, he was used to dine upon Saturday as well as the Lord's-day. Which is often noted also by St. Austin[14], in answering a scruple, which perplexed his mother Monicha and some others, concerning the observation of this day, when they could not well account for the different practices of different Churches, some of which kept it as a fast and others as a festival. To satisfy their doubts, he told them[15], 'that in all things of this nature, where the Scripture had determined nothing positively one way or other, the custom of the people of God, and the rules of our forefathers, were to be taken for a law: and to dispute about such things, and condemn the practice of one Church from the contrary custom of another, was to raise endless debates, and lose charity in the heat of contention.' He added[16], 'that for the sake of his mother Monicha, he once went to consult St. Ambrose upon this particular question; who told him, he could give no better advice in the case, than to do as he himself did: for when I go to Rome, said he, I fast on the Saturday, as they do at Rome; when I am here, I do not fast. So likewise you, whatever Church you come to, observe the custom of the place, if you would neither give offence to others, nor take offence from them.' 'With this answer,' he says, 'he satisfied his mother, and ever after looked upon it as an oracle sent from heaven.'

Nothing can be plainer now, than that the Saturday-fast was not received in all the Churches of the West, since even at Milan it always continued to be a festival. And even those Churches, which turned it into a fast, could not agree about the reason and original of it. Some said it was instituted by St. Peter at Rome, upon a particular occasion: for when he was to contend with Simon Magus on the Lord's-day[17], for the

[14] Ubi supr. c. 1. (t. 2. p. 68 d.) Quod ergo me consulis, utrum liceat Sabbato jejunare; respondeo, &c.

[15] Ibid. (e.) In his enim rebus, de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. De quibus si disputare voluerimus, et ex aliorum consuetudine alios improbare, orietur interminata luctatio, quæ labore sermocinationis cum certa documenta nulla veritatis insinuet, utique cavendum est, ne tempestate contentionis serenitatem caritatis obnubilet.

[16] Ep. 118. [al. 54.] ad Januar. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 124 e.) Mater mea Mediolanum me consecuta, &c.

[17] Ep. ad Casulan. ut supr. c. 9. p. 146. (t. 2. p. 76 d.) Est quidem et hæc opinio plurimorum, quamvis eam perhibeant esse falsam plerique Romani, quod Apostolus Petrus,

danger of the great temptation he held a fast with the Church at Rome the day before, and having obtained a prosperous and glorious success thereby, he continued the same custom, and some of the Western Churches followed his example. But many among the Romans themselves rejected this as a mere fiction, even in St. Austin's time, though others continued still in the belief of it, as appears from what is said in Cassian[18], and some later writers, about this fast in the Roman Church. Pope Innocent[19] gives another reason for it: 'Because on this day our Saviour lay buried in the grave, and the Apostles were in deep sorrow for their Master, and hid themselves for fear of the Jews.' Which is the usual reason now assigned by the learned writers of the present Roman Church, Baronius[20], Bellarmin[21], Combefis[22], and others. Yet this was only a con-

cum Simone Mago die Dominico certaturus, propter ipsum magnæ tentationis periculum, pridie cum ejusdem urbis ecclesia jejunaverit, et, consecuto tam prospero gloriosoque successu, eundem morem tenuerit, eumque imitatæ sunt nonnullæ Occidentis ecclesiæ.

[18] Instit. l. 3. c. 10. (p. 46.) Cujus moderaminis causam nonnulli in quibusdam Occidentalibus civitatibus ignorantes, et maxime in Urbe, idcirco putant absolutionem Sabbati minime debere præsumi, quod Apostolum Petrum [in] eodem die contra Simonem conflictaturum asserunt jejunasse, &c.—Anonymus de Francis et reliquis Latinis, ap. Combefis. Hist. Monothelit.—[Not. ad Invect. Auctar. Nov. Isaac. Armen.] (t. 2. p. 429 d. 3.) Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν νηστεύουσι τὰ Σάββατα, οἵτινες Σαββατιανοὶ ὀνομάζονται· καὶ ἐρωτώμενοι, διὰ τί ταύτην νηστεύουσι, προφασίζονται, ὅτι ἐν Σαββάτου ἡμέρᾳ ἔρριψε [ὁ Σίμων Πέτρος] τὸν Σίμωνα Μάγον, ὃς καὶ συντριβεὶς διερράγη· καὶ τούτου χάριν νηστεύουσι τὰ Σάββατα. Ψεύδονται δέ· ἀπὸ γάρ τινος Σαββατίου νηστεύειν τὰ Σάββατα παρέλαβον· οὗτος γὰρ ὁ τρισκατάρατος Σαββάτιος, τοῖς λόγοις καὶ τῇ ἀκέσει τοῦ Μάγεντος ὑπαχθεὶς, ἐξέμεσε καὶ αὐτὸς βλασφημίας ῥήματα, καὶ πολλὰς ἐκ τῶν προγραφεισῶν αἱρέσεων ἐκήρυξεν ὁ ἄθλιος· ὅστις ἐπαινέθη παρὰ τῶν Ἀλεμάνων, καὶ Ἀφρικιανῶν· καὶ τῶν Ἱσπανίαν οἰκούντων, καὶ πολλῶν διαιτώντων ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ· τελευτῶντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, διετάξατο τοῖς αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς, νηστεύειν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τὰ Σάββατα, διότι Σαββάτιος κέκληται· καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης νηστείας μνείαν αὐτοῦ ποιοῦντες μέμνηνται καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ.

[19] Ep. 1. ad Decentium, c. 4. (CC. t. 2. p. 1246 d.)...Si...sexta feria propter passionem Domini jejujamus, Sabbatum prætermittere non debemus, quod inter tristitiam atque lætitiam temporis istius [al. illius] [nempe Paschatis] videtur inclusum. Nam utique constat, Apostolos biduo isto in mœrore fuisse, et propter metum Judæorum se occuluisse.

[20] An. 57. n. 207. (t. 1. p. 514 e.) At cum hæc servarentur, &c.

[21] L. 2. de Bon. Oper. c. 18. (t. 4. p. 469.) Romana ecclesia et Occidens universus ... jejunat Sabbato .... in memoriam humilitatis Domini, qui die Sabbati jacuit mortuus et clausus in sepulchro.

[22] Ubi supra. (ibid. p. 431 a. 3.) Probabilior videtur [ratio], quam Humbertus ex Sancto Silvestro refert, ut Latini in memoriam sepulturæ Dominicæ ac luctus discipulorum Domini Sabbatis omnibus jejunent.

jecture of Pope Innocent, which may serve for a reason why the Roman Church might turn the Saturday into a fast before his time, but does not prove that to have been the original practice. Socrates[23] makes the Roman Church to vary once more in this matter: for he says, 'in his time they did not fast on Saturdays at Rome even in Lent, but only five days in the week:' and Valesius[24] and Menardus[25] go further, and assert, that in the time of Pope Leo they kept but three days in the week fasting in Lent at Rome: for which they allege the words of Pope Leo himself in one of his Lent-Sermons[26]: 'On the second and fourth and sixth days of the week, that is, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, let us fast: and on the Sabbath celebrate our vigil at St. Peter's church.' But since Mr. Quesnel[27] and Pagi[28] have shown this passage to be foisted into Leo's

[23] L. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 294. 15.) *Οἱ μὲν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, τρεῖς πρὸ τοῦ Πάσχα ἑβδομάδας, πλὴν Σαββάτου καὶ Κυριακῆς, συνημμένας νηστεύουσιν.*

[24] In Loc. (ibid. n. 2.) .... Immerito Baronius Socrati opponit testimonium Gregorii Magni. Aliter enim Socratis ætate, aliter Gregorii Magni temporibus, Romani per Quadragesimam jejunabant. Temporibus Leonis Papæ, quibus fere æqualis fuit Socrates, Romani tribus duntaxat diebus hebdomadis jejunabant in Quadragesima, secunda scilicet, quarta et sexta feria, ut patet ex Sermonibus ejusdem Papæ de Quadragesima.

[25] In Sacramentar. Greg. M., cited by Pagi in Baron. an. 55. n. 8. (t. 1. p. 43.) Hugo Menardus, Sacramentarium S. Gregorii commentans, istam explicationem merito rejicit, ostenditque quatuor illos dies Gregorii ipsius ætate in usu non fuisse, nedum Leonis temporibus. In eum autem ut ipse sententiam, non plures revera dies Romæ tunc temporis jejunio fuisse consecratos, quam qui in Sermone a B. Leone designantur.

[26] Serm. 4. [al. 42.] de Quadragesima. (Ed. Paris. 1671. p. 39. col. sinistr.) Secunda igitur et quarta et sexta feria jejunemus: Sabbato autem apud B. Petrum Apostolum vigilias celebremus. [These words and several preceding clauses are omitted in the Ed. Ballerin. Venet. 1753. (See Serm. 42. al. de Quadrages. 4. c. 6. t. 1. p. 162.) in accordance with Quesnell in loc. (see ibid. n. 36.) They occur, however, with the omission of *secunda*, in De Jejun. Decim. Mens. Serm. 1. (Serm. 12. ut supr. p. 43.) and in De Jejun. Pentecost. Serm. 4. (Serm. 81. ut supr. p. 320.) Quarta igitur et sexta, &c. Ed.]

[27] Dissert. 6. de Jejunio Sabbati, c. 18. Oper. Leon. M. (Lugdun. 1700. t. 2. p. 290.) Non ea autem sola abjudicanda sunt Leoni, &c.—See the next note.

[28] Crit. in Baron. an. 57. n. 2. [Corrige, an. 55. n. 8.] (t. 1. p. 43.) Ait vir eruditissimus [Quesnellus] Leonis non esse verba illa, quæ objiciuntur, sed Sermoni ejus esse superaddita, occasione ac ratione mox explicanda. Nam penes antiquiores et melioris notæ codices arbitrium est et jus et norma de dubiis veterum scriptorum fœtibus, aut interpolationibus decernendi, et in quinque vetustissimis MSS., uno nempe Regio, duobus Thuaneis, Navarrico et San-Germanensi, verba illa absunt, totusque ille pannus a nobis descriptus desideratur. Eum itaque insititium esse non dubitandum. Norunt omnes in more fuisse apud monachos et clericos, homilias ser-

is a very great mistake in learned men. For, not to mention what Clemens Alexandrinus[31] says of the Basilidian heretics, that they asserted, that Christ was born on the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth of the month, which the Egyptians call Pharmuthi, that is, April; he says a more remarkable thing[32] of some others, who were more curious about the year and the day of Christ's nativity, which they said was in the twenty-eighth year of Augustus Cæsar, and the twenty-fifth day of the month Pachon; which though Pamelius[33] artfully calls December, to serve the common hypothesis, and impose upon his reader, yet nothing is more certain than it signifies the month of May, as Mr. Basnage[34] has at large demonstrated out of Epiphanius and Theophilus Alexandrinus, who usually follow the Egyptian calendar, where Pachon answers to our May, as every one knows, who has any understanding in the several styles by which the ancient writers made their chronological computations.

others
ed to the

2. But what is more considerable in this matter, is, that the

[31] Stromat. 1. (p. 408. 9.) Καὶ μὴν τινὲς αὐτῶν φασὶ Φαρμουθὶ γεγεννῆσθαι κδ' ἢ κε'.

[32] Ibid. (p. 407. 18.) Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ περιεργότερον τῇ γενέσει τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν οὐ μόνον τὸ ἔτος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν προστιθέντες.

[33] Not. in Tertul. cont. Judæos, c. 8. n. 78.—Vid. Oper. Tertul. per Pamel. Paris. 1695. (Ed. Mercer. c. Not. Pamelii, Colon. Agripp. 1617. p. 190 f.) Deinde addit [Clemens] aliorum sententiam, qui subtilius, inquit, natali Domini non solum annum sed et diem addunt, quem dicunt 29. anno Augusti [sic enim legendum pro eo, quod mendose iterum est 28.] in 25. mensis Pachon [quem nos Decembrem dicimus] natum.

[34] Exercit. in Baron. an. 37. (p. 216.) Ecclesiæ suæ disciplina imbutus Pamelius Ægyptium Pachon Decembri vindicat Notis in Tertullianum: *Pachon quem nos Decembrem dicimus:* n. 78. advers. Judæos. Quo concesso, admirabili consensu Latinorum sententia cum Ægyptiorum opinione conspiraret. Sed Pamelius maxime fallitur: constat enim ab edito Christo sic menses esse dirigendos:—

Ægypt.	*Latin.*	*Syro-Græc. ex Epiphan.*
Tybi	Januarius	Αὐδυναῖος
Mechir	Februarius	Περίτιος
Phamenoth	Martius	Δύστρος
Pharmuti [s. thi]	Aprilis	Ξάντικος
Pachon	Maius	Ἀρτεμίσιος
Payni	Junius	Δαίσιος
Epiphi	Julius	Πάνεμος
Mesori	Augustus	Λῶος
Thoth	September	Γορπαῖος
Paophi	October	Ὑπερβερεταῖος
Athyr	November	Δῖος
Choiac	December	Ἀπελλαῖος, κ. τ. λ.

part of the Eastern Church for three or four of the
s kept the feast of Christ's Nativity on the same day,
now called Epiphany, or the sixth of January, which
Christ's *manifestation* to the world in four several
which at first were all commemorated upon this day:
y his nativity or incarnation, which was the appearance
nanifested in the flesh. 2. By the appearance of the
ich guided the wise men unto Christ at his birth, and
Epiphany or *manifestation* of him to the Gentiles.
e glorious appearance that was made at his baptism,
e heavens were opened, and the Holy Ghost descended
ily shape like a dove and lighted upon him, and a voice
m heaven saying, "This is my beloved Son in whom
ll pleased." 4. By the appearance or manifestation of
ity, when by his first miracle he turned the water into
he marriage in Cana of Galilee. That this day was
ur Saviour's birthday for several ages by the Churches
t, Jerusalem, Antioch, Cyprus, and other Churches of
, is so evident from good authorities[35], that among
men it is now a thing beyond all dispute. Cassian[36]
ressly, 'that in his time all the Egyptian provinces,
e general name of *Epiphany*, understood as well the
of Christ as his baptism: and therefore they did not
orate those two mysteries upon two distinct days, as
l in the Western provinces, but celebrated both of
gether upon that one day's festival. And Gennadius[37]
one Timothy a bishop, who composed a book con-
he nativity of the Lord, which he supposed to be on
of Epiphany. Cotelerius[38] not improbably conjectures,

day of Epiphany or sixth of January.

Cotelerium in Constit. 5. c. 13. (v. 1. p. 312.

it. 10. c. 2. (p. 383.) . . . .
rum die, quem provinciæ
rdotes, vel Dominici bap-
secundum carnem nativi-
lefiniunt; et idcirco utri-
amenti solemnitatem non
in Occiduis provinciis,
ma diei hujus festivitate
nt.

scriptor. Eccles. c. 58. (int.
ron. t. 2. p. 974.) Timotheus episcopus composuit librum de nativitate Domini secundum carnem, quam credit in Theophania factam.

[38] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 13. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 313. n. 32.) Ægyptii, referente Cassiano, Collatione 10. cap. 2., ... diem Epiphaniorum definiebant diem baptismi Dominici et Dominicæ nativitatis. Unde forsan Timotheus ille episcopus, qui a Gennadio dicitur composuisse librum *De nativitate Domini*, quam credebat in Epiphania

that this was no other than Timothy bishop of Alexandria, though Dr. Cave[39] speaks of him as a later writer. But before the time of the Council of Ephesus, anno 431, the Egyptians had altered the day of Christ's nativity, and fixed it to the twenty-ninth day of their month Chœac, which is the twenty-fifth of December: as appears from the Homily of Paulus Emisenus[40], spoken before Cyril of Alexandria, and related in the Acts of that Council. It was not long before this, that the Churches of Antioch and Syria came into the Western observation. For Chrysostom[41], in one of his Homilies to the people of Antioch, tells them that ten years were not yet past, since they came to the true knowledge of the day of Christ's birth, which they kept before on Epiphany, till the Western Church gave them better information. And from that time the Nativity and Epiphany were distinct festivals, as appears from other Homilies[42] of this writer, where he speaks distinctly of them as two days, which had been thought one and the same before.

Epiphanius, who was bishop of Salamis or Constantia, the metropolis of Cyprus, often speaks of Christ's nativity, and always follows the Eastern calculation, fixing it to the same day with Epiphany in the month of January. In one place[43] he says, 'It is not lawful to fast on the day of Epiphany, on which day the Lord was born in the flesh.' In another[44] he takes a great

factam, est Timotheus Alexandrinus.

39 Hist. Liter. (t. 1. p. 304.) Timotheus episcopus, cujusnam urbis non constat. Claruit circa an. 415. Scripsit librum *De nativitate Domini secundum carnem*, quam in die Epiphaniæ contigisse arbitratus est.

40 Hom. in Act. C. Ephes. part. 3. c. 31. (CC. t. 3. p. 1096.) Ὁμιλία Παύλου ἐπισκόπου Ἐμίσης, λεχθεῖσα κθ' Χοιὰκ ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἀλεξανδρείας, καθημένου τοῦ μακαρίου Κυρίλλου, εἰς τὴν Γέννησιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

41 Hom. 31. de Natal. Christ. t. 5. p. 466. (t. 2. p. 355 a.). . Οὔπω δέκατόν ἐστιν ἔτος, ἐξ οὗ δῆλη καὶ γνώριμος ἡμῖν αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα γεγένηται· . . . . παρὰ μὲν τοῖς τὴν Ἑσπέραν οἰκοῦσιν ἄνωθεν γνωριζομένη, πρὸς ἡμᾶς δὲ κομισθεῖσα νῦν, καὶ οὐ πρὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ἀθρόον οὕτως ἀνέδραμε, κ. τ. λ.

42 Hom. 24. de Bapt. Christ. t. 1. p. 311. (ibid. p. 369 b, d.) Ὅτι μὲν οὖν Ἐπιφάνεια ἡ παροῦσα λέγεται ἑορτὴ, δῆλόν ἐστι πᾶσι. . . Ἀλλὰ τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐχὶ ἡ ἡμέρα καθ' ἣν ἐτέχθη, ἀλλ' ἡ ἡμέρα, καθ' ἣν ἐβαπτίσθη, Ἐπιφάνεια λέγεται· αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, καθ' ἣν ἐβαπτίσατο, καὶ τὴν τῶν ὑδάτων ἡγίασε φύσιν.

43 Expos. Fid. n. 22. (t. 1. p. 1105 a.) Οὔτε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν Ἐπιφανίων, ὅτε ἐγεννήθη ἐν σαρκὶ ὁ Κύριος, ἔξεστι νηστεῦσαι.

44 Hær. 51. Alog. n. 24. (ibid. p. 446 d.) Γεννηθέντος γὰρ αὐτοῦ περὶ τὸν Ἰαννουάριον μῆνα, τουτέστι πρὸ ὀκτὼ εἰδῶν. Ἰαννουαρίων, ἥτις ἐστὶ κατὰ Ῥωμαίους πέμπτη τοῦ Ἰαννουαρίου μηνός· κατὰ Αἰγυπτίους, Τυβὶ ἑνδεκάτη· κατὰ Σύρους, εἴτουν Ἑλλη-

deal of pains to make his reader understand 'that Christ was born in January; that is,' says he, 'on the eighth of the Ides of January, which is the fifth of January, according to the Romans[45], and the eleventh of Tybi according to the Egyptians, and the sixth of Audynæus according to the Syro-Macedonians, and the fifth of the fifth month according to the Cypriots or Salaminians, and the fourteenth of Julius according to the Paphians, and the twenty-first of Aleon according to the Arabians, and the thirteenth of Atarta according to the Cappadocians, and the thirteenth of Tibeth according to the Hebrews, and the sixth of Mæmacterion according to the Athenians.'

Nothing could be more particular in fixing the day of Christ's nativity to that of Epiphany, or Epiphany to the fifth or sixth of January, than this so minute account of Epiphanius. Which is confirmed by St. Jerom[46], who, though he differed from Epiphanius as to the day of Christ's nativity, yet he intimates, that there were some who still believed that Christ was born upon the Epiphany, which was the fifth of January,

νας, Αὐδυναίου [ἕκτου] ἕκτη· κατὰ Κυπρίους, εἴτουν Σαλαμινίους, πέμπτου πέμπτη· κατὰ Παφίους, Ἰουλου τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτη· κατὰ Ἄραβας, Ἀλεὼμ κα'· κατὰ Καππαδόκας, Ἀταρτᾶ ιγ'· κατὰ Ἑβραίους, Τιβιὴθ ιγ'· κατὰ Ἀθηναίους· Μαιμακτηριῶνος ϛ'. Παρῆλθε τὰς προειρημένας ὑπατείας εἰκοσιεννέα πλήρεις, κ. τ. λ.

[45] Some think this should be written, *the sixth of January*, because the eighth of the Ides of January is the sixth of January in the Roman Calendar: but St. Jerom also places Epiphany upon the fifth of January, Comment. in Ezek. 1. p. 459. (t. 5. p. 6 a.) .... In quarto mense, qui apud nos vocatur Januarius, &c. And the Asiatics did so likewise. Vid. Usser. de Anno Solari Macedonum et Asianorum. l. al. c. 2.—See the next note.

[46] Vid. Usser. ibid. (Works, v. 7. p. 392.) A vicesimo quarto .... Decembris die incipiebat quartus Asianorum mensis, maxima sui parte Januario respondens; cujus die quinta Theophania apud illos celebrata fuisse hinc colligimus; non, ut apud alios, die sexto. Quod Hieronymi loco lucem non modicam præfert in Commentariis ad caput primum Ezechielis: ubi tempus visionis illius, anno tricesimo, die quinto quarti mensis exhibitæ, ad Christum, anno ætatis tricesimo in Theophaniis vel Epiphaniis baptizatum, ita per anagogen accommodat: *Illud intelligendum, quod in tricesimo ætatis suæ anno Dominus ad baptismum venerit: in quarto mense, qui apud nos vocatur Januarius*, &c. Apud Orientales enim populos, post collectionem frugum et torcularia, quando decimæ deferebantur in Templum, October erat primus mensis, et Januarius quartus. Quintam autem diem mensis adjungit, ut significet baptisma, in quo aperti sunt Christo cœli, et Epiphaniorum dies huc usque venerabilis est; (non ut quidam putant, natalis in carne: tunc enim absconditus est, et non apparuit;) quod huic tempori congruit, quando dictum est, *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui.*

festivals,' and 'the metropolis or mother of all festivals:' adding, 'that from this both the Theophania, (so he styles Epiphany,) and the holy Paschal feast, and the Assumption or Ascension, and Pentecost took their original.' 'For if Christ had not been born according to the flesh, he had not been baptized, which is the Theophania (or Epiphany): neither had he been crucified, which is the Paschal festival: neither had he sent the Holy Ghost, which is our Pentecost. But we do not give this festival the preference merely upon this account, but because the thing that was done upon this day was more tremendous than all others. For that Christ should die when he was a man, was a thing of natural consequence; but that when he was God he should be willing to be made man, and condescend to humble himself beyond all imagination and conception, this is indeed wonderful and astonishing in the highest degree. In admiration of this, St. Paul as it were in a rapture says, "Without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness! God was manifested in the flesh!" [1 Tim. 3, 16.] For this reason chiefly I love and embrace this day, and propound it to you, that I may make you partakers of the same inducement of love. I therefore pray and beseech you, come with all diligence and alacrity, every man first purging his own house, to see our Lord wrapt in swaddling-clothes and

Θεοφάνια, καὶ τὸ Πάσχα τὸ ἱερὸν, καὶ ἡ Ἀνάληψις, καὶ ἡ Πεντηκοστὴ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῆς ὑπόθεσιν ἔλαβον. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐτέχθη κατὰ σάρκα ὁ Χριστὸς, οὐκ ἂν ἐβαπτίσθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὰ Θεοφάνια· οὐκ ἂν ἐσταυρώθη, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ Πάσχα· οὐκ ἂν τὸ Πνεῦμα κατέπεμψεν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἡ Πεντηκοστή· ὥστε ἐντεῦθεν, ὥσπερ ἀπό τινος πηγῆς ποταμοὶ διάφοροι ῥυέντες, αὗται ἐτέχθησαν ἡμῖν αἱ ἑορταί. Οὐ κατὰ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον δικαία ταύτης ἂν εἴη τῆς προσεδρίας ἀπολαύειν ἡ ἡμέρα, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γενόμενον τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων πολὺ φρικωδέστερόν ἐστι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον τὸν Χριστὸν ἀποθανεῖν, τῆς ἀκολουθίας λοιπὸν ἦν· εἰ γὰρ [καὶ] ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν· ἀλλὰ θνητὸν σῶμα ἀνέλαβεν· καὶ ἦν μὲν καὶ τοῦτο θαυμαστόν· τὸ δὲ Θεὸν ὄντα ἄνθρωπον θελῆσαι γενέσθαι καὶ ἀνασχέσθαι καταβῆναι τοσοῦτον, ὅσον οὐδὲ διάνοια δέξασθαι δύναται, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ φρικωδέστατον, καὶ ἐκπλήξεως γέμον. Ὁ δὴ καὶ Παῦλος θαυμάζων ἔλεγεν, Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· ποῖον μέγα; Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί. Καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ, Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται· ὅθεν ὤφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι. Διὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἀσπάζομαι τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην καὶ φιλῶ, καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα εἰς μέσον προτίθημι, ἵνα κοινωνοὺς ὑμᾶς ποιήσω τοῦ φίλτρου. Διὰ τοῦτο δέομαι πάντων ὑμῶν καὶ ἀντιβολῶ, μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς καὶ προθυμίας παραγένεσθαι, τὴν οἰκίαν ἕκαστον κενώσαντα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· ἵνα ἴδωμεν τὸν Δεσπότην ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς φάτνης κείμενον, ἐσπαργανωμένον, τὸ φρικτὸν ἐκεῖνο καὶ παράδοξον θέαμα.

lying in a manger. A tremendous and wonderful sight indeed!'

Thus the holy father invites his auditory five days beforehand to celebrate the Nativity of Christ. And we may observe, that the day was kept with the same veneration and religious solemnity as the Lord's-day. For they had always sermons on this day, of which there are many instances in Chrysostom, Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Austin, Leo, Chrysologus, and many others. Neither did they let this day ever pass without a solemn communion. For Chrysostom in this very place[67] invites his people to the holy table, telling them, 'that if they came with faith, they might see Christ lying in the manger: for the holy table supplied the place of the manger; the body of the Lord was laid upon the holy table, not as before wrapt in swaddling-clothes, but invested on every side with the Holy Spirit.' And that the solemnity might be more universally observed, liberty was granted on this day to servants to rest from their ordinary labours, as on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day. This is particularly mentioned by the Author of the Apostolical Constitutions[68]: 'Let servants rest from their labour on the day of Christ's nativity, because on this day an unexpected blessing was given unto men, in that the Word of God, Jesus Christ, was born of the Virgin Mary for the salvation of the world.' And all fasting was as strictly prohibited on this festival as on the Lord's-day: and no one without suspicion of some impious heresy could go against this rule, as appears from what Pope Leo[69] says of the Priscillianists, 'that they

[67] [Ibid. (p. 498 a.) *Καὶ γὰρ ἂν μετὰ πίστεως παραγενώμεθα, πάντως αὐτὸν ὀψόμεθα ἐπὶ τῆς φάτνης κείμενον· ἡ γὰρ τράπεζα αὕτη τάξιν τῆς φάτνης πληροῖ· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐνταῦθα κείσεται τὸ σῶμα τὸ Δεσποτικόν· οὐχὶ ἐσπαργανωμένον, καθάπερ τότε, ἀλλὰ Πνεύματι πανταχόθεν Ἁγίῳ περιστελλόμενον. Grischov.*]

[68] L. 8. c. 33. See before, s. 3, the third part of n. 52, preceding.

[69] Ep. 93. ad Turribium, c. 4. (CC. t. 3. p. 1412 b.) .... Natalem Christi, quem secundum susceptionem veri hominis Catholica ecclesia veneratur, quia *Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis*, non vere isti honorent, sed honorare se simulent, jejunantes eodem die, sicut et die Dominico, qui est resurrectionis Christi. Quod utique ideo faciunt, quia Christum Dominum in vera hominis natura natum esse non credunt, sed per quandam illusionem ostentata videri volunt, quæ vera non fuerint, sequentes dogma Cerdonis et Marcionis, et cognatis suis Manichæis per omnia concordantes. —Vid. C. Bracar. 1. [al. 2.] c. 4. (t. 5. p. 837 e.) Si quis Natalem Christi secundum carnem non bene honorat, sed honorare se simulat, jejunans in eodem die, et in Dominico, &c.

dishonoured the day of Christ's nativity and the Lord's-day by fasting, which they pretended they did only for the exercise of devotion in an ascetic life, but in reality it was to affront the days of his nativity and resurrection, because with Cerdon and Marcion, and the Manichees, they neither believed the truth of our Saviour's incarnation, nor his resurrection.' Therefore, in opposition to these and such like heresies, the Church was always very jealous of any who pretended to make a fast of the Nativity of Christ.

Finally, to show all possible honour to this day, the Church obliged all persons to frequent religious assemblies in the city-churches, and not go to any of the lesser churches in the country[70], except some necessity of sickness or infirmity compelled them so to do. And the laws of the State prohibited all public games and shows on this day as on the Lord's-day. For though at first the prohibition only extended to the Lord's-day, yet Theodosius Junior, by a new law[71], restrained them on the Lord's-day, and Epiphany, and the Paschal festival, and the fifty days of Pentecost, because at these times the minds of Christians ought to be wholly employed in the worship and service of God.

Some[72] also think the very design of appointing the

[70] Vid. C. Aurelian. 1. c. 27. [al. 25.] (t. 4. p. 1408 d.) Ut nulli civium Paschæ, Natalis [Domini] vel Quadragesimæ solemnia [al. solemnitatem] in villa liceat celebrare, nisi quem infirmitas probabitur tenuisse.

[71] Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. (t. 5. p. 353.) Dominico, et Natali, atque Epiphaniorum Christi, Paschæ etiam et Quinquagesimæ diebus, ... omni theatrorum atque circensium voluptate per universas urbes, earundem populis denegata, totæ Christianorum ac fidelium mentes Dei cultibus occupentur, &c.

[72] Hospinianus de Fest. Christian. Ed. Tigur. 1593. p. 111. (Ed. Genev. 1674. p. 43. col. sinistr.) Fuit autem hæc dies apud Romanos celebris olim in honorem Augusti Cæsaris . . . . Hanc ergo solemnitatem in melius ecclesia commutare volens, Epiphaniarum festum in ejus locum instituit. *Durandi Rationale, l.* 6. *c.* 16. [Epiphaniæ Origo. (fol. 281. vers.) Ideo autem institutum fuit hac die festum, &c.—Grischovius, v. 9. p. 78. n. p., observes *In meo edit. nihil hujus exstat*, with reference to the Author's remarks in the text above, 'Some also think the very design, &c.;' and a recent editor, who has done little more than copy from the Latin Translator of the original, has consequently left the reference (*Hospinianus de Festis Christianor. p.* 111. viz. of the Ed. Tigurin. 1593, which my ancestor consulted) unverified; adding, *These words do not occur in the Geneva edition of* 1674! But *that* is the edition which I have used, where I find the passage as I have given it above, and which is evidently the place to which my ancestor referred in connection with the similar statement of Durandus, whose authority is also cited by Hospinian, as above. Ed.]

feasts of Christ's Nativity and Epiphany at this season of the year, was chiefly to oppose the vanities and excesses which the Heathen indulged themselves in upon their Saturnalia and Kalends of January at this very time of the year. Nazianzen's exhortation to his people on the Nativity of Christ[73] seems directly intended against them, when he thus endeavours to guard his auditory from running into the same abuses: 'Let us celebrate this festival, not after the way of the world, but in a divine and celestial manner; not minding our own things, but the things of the Lord; not the things that tend to make us sick and infirm, but those things which will heal and cure us. Let us not crown our doors with garlands, nor exercise ourselves in dances. Let us not adorn our streets, nor feed our eyes, nor gratify our ears with music, nor any of our senses, touching, tasting, smelling, with any of those things that lead the way to vice; and are the inlets of sin. Let us not effeminately adorn ourselves with soft clothing, nor jewels, nor gold, nor artificial colours invented to destroy the divine image in us. Let us not indulge rioting and drunkenness, which are frequently attended with chambering and wantonness. Let us not set up our lofty canopies or tables,

[73] Orat. 38. in Theophaniam sive Natalem Christi. (t. 1. p. 614 c.) Τοιγαροῦν ἑορτάζωμεν, μὴ παηγυρικῶς, ἀλλὰ θεϊκῶς· μὴ κοσμικῶς, ἀλλ' ὑπερκοσμίκως· μὴ τὰ ἡμετέρα, ἀλλὰ τὰ τοῦ ἡμετέρου, μᾶλλον δὲ τὰ τοῦ Δεσπότου· μὴ τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῆς ἰατρείας· μὴ τὰ τῆς πλάσεως, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῆς ἀναπλάσεως. Ἔσται δὲ τοῦτο πῶς; μὴ πρόθυρα στεφανώσωμεν, μὴ χοροὺς συστησώμεθα, μὴ κοσμήσωμεν ἀγυίας, μὴ ὀφθαλμὸν ἑστιάσωμεν, μὴ ἀκοὴν καταυλήσωμεν, μὴ ὄσφρησιν ἐκθηλύνωμεν, μὴ γεῦσιν καταπορνεύσωμεν, μὴ ἁφῇ χαρισώμεθα ταῖς προχείροις εἰς κακίαν ὁδοῖς, καὶ εἰσόδοις τῆς ἁμαρτίας· μὴ ἐσθῆτι μαλακισθῶμεν, ἁπαλῇ τε καὶ περιρρεούσῃ, καὶ ἧς τὸ κάλλιστον ἀχρηστία· μὴ λίθων διαυγείαις, μὴ χρυσοῦ περιλάμψεσι, μὴ χρωμάτων σοφίσμασι ψευδομένων τὸ φυσικὸν κάλλος, καὶ κατὰ τῆς εἰκόνος ἐξευρημένων· μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, οἷς κοίτας καὶ ἀσελγείας οἶδα συνεζευγμένας· ἐπειδὴ κακῶν διδασκάλων κακὰ τὰ μαθήματα· μᾶλλον δὲ πονηρῶν σπερμάτων πονηρὰ τὰ γεώργια· μὴ στιβάδας ὑψηλὰς πηξώμεθα, σκηνοποιοῦντες τῇ γαστρὶ τὰ τῆς θρύψεως· μὴ τιμήσωμεν οἴνων τοὺς ἀνθοσμίας, ὀψοποιῶν μαγγανείας, μύρων πολυτελείας· μὴ γῆ καὶ θάλασσα τὴν τιμίαν ἡμῖν κόπρον δωροφορείτωσαν. Οὕτω γὰρ ἐγὼ τιμᾷν οἶδα τρυφήν· μὴ ἄλλος ἄλλον ἀκρασίᾳ νικᾷν σπουδάζωμεν· ἀκρασία γὰρ ἐμοὶ πᾶν τὸ περιττὸν καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν χρείαν· καὶ ταῦτα πεινώντων ἄλλων καὶ δεομένων, τῶν ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πηλοῦ τε καὶ κράματος. Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν Ἕλλησι παρῶμεν, καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς κόμποις καὶ πανηγύρεσιν· οἱ καὶ θεοὺς ὀνομάζουσι κνίσσαις χαίροντας, καὶ ἀκολούθως τὸ θεῖον τῇ γαστρὶ θεραπεύουσι· πονηροὶ πονηρῶν δαιμόνων καὶ πλάσται, καὶ μυσταγωγοί, καὶ μύσται τυγχάνοντες. Ἡμεῖς δὲ, οἷς Λόγος τὸ προσκυνούμενον, κάν τι δέῃ τρυφᾷν, ἐν λόγῳ τρυφήσωμεν, καὶ θείῳ νόμῳ, καὶ διηγήμασι, τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἡ παροῦσα πανήγυρις.

providing delicacies for the belly; nor be enamoured with the fragrancy of wines, or niceties of cookery, and precious ointments. Let not sea and land present us with their precious dung, for that is the best name I can give their delights, nor let any of us strive to outdo one another in luxury and intemperance. But let us leave these things to the Heathen, and to their heathenish pomps and festivals, who give the name of gods to those who delight in the smell of sacrifices, and agreeably worship their deities with the belly, being wicked makers of wicked devils, and as wicked priests and worshippers of them. But let us, who worship the Word of God, place our delights in the divine law, and such discourses as are proper and agreeable to the present festival.'

Epiphanias a distinct festi-

6. As to Epiphany, they who observed it as a distinct festival from the Nativity, did it chiefly upon the account of our Saviour's baptism, and the appearing of the star which conducted the wise men of the East to come and worship our Saviour. To which some added two other reasons, that of our Saviour's first miracle wrought at Cana in Galilee, when he turned the water into wine; and that other miracle of his feeding five thousand men with five loaves. All which are put together in one of the Sermons, which go under the name of St. Austin, upon this day. 'On this day,' says he[74], 'we celebrate the mystery of God's manifesting himself by his miracles in human nature; either because on this day the star in heaven gave notice of his birth; or because he turned water into wine at the marriage-feast at Cana in Galilee; or because he consecrated water for the reparation of mankind by his baptism in the river Jordan; or because with the five loaves he fed five thousand men. For each of these contains the mysteries and joys of our salvation.' Petrus Chrysologus[75] and Eucherius

[74] Serm. 29. de Temp. [al. Append. Serm. 136.] (t. 5 append. p. 244 a.) Hodie vero illud [scil. sacramentum] colimus, quo se in homine Deus virtutibus declaravit, pro eo quod in hac die; sive quod in cœlo stella ortus sui nuntium præbuit; sive quod in Cana Galileæ in convivio nuptiali aquam in vinum convertit; sive quod in Jordanis undis aquas ad reparationem humani generis suo baptismo consecravit; sive quod de quinque panibus quinque millia hominum satiavit. In quolibet horum salutis nostræ mysteria continentur et gaudia.

[75] Serm. 157. de Epiphania et Magis. (p. 221.) Per Epiphaniam Magi Christum Dominum muneribus mysticis confitentur, &c. Per Epiphaniam Christus in nuptiis aquas saporavit in vinum, &c. Per

Lugdunensis[76] mention the three first reasons, but not the last. Pope Leo has eight Sermons upon this festival[77], in which he insists upon no other reason but the manifestation of Christ's birth to the wise men, by the appearance of the star. St. Jerom[78] on the other hand makes it to be celebrated chiefly in commemoration of our Saviour's baptism, and the manifestation of him to t' e world by the voice that came from heaven, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." [Luke 3, 22.] And the Greek writers commonly insist upon this reason. 'Why,' says Chrysostom[79], 'is not the day on which Christ was born called Epiphany, but the day on which he was baptized? Because he was not manifested to all when he was born, but when he was baptized. For to the day of his baptism he was generally unknown. As appears from those words of John the Baptist, "There standeth one among you, whom ye know not." And what wonder that others should not know him, when the Baptist himself knew him not before that day. "For I knew him not," says he, "but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."' Gregory Nazianzen[80] assigns the same reason for the observation of this festival: 'This holy day of lights, to which we are come, and which we this day celebrate as a festival, had its original from

Epiphaniam Christus Jordanis undas ad baptisma nostrum consecratas intravit, &c.

[76] Hom. in Vigil. S. Andreæ. (ap. Bibl. Magn. Colon. Agripp. 1618. t. 5. part. 1. p. 716 d. 11. sub nomine Eusebii Gallicani.) Tertia autem die nuptiæ factæ sunt, &c.

[77] Sermones in Epiphaniam, pp. 25, seqq. [Commencing at Serm. 31., according to the Ed. Ballerin. Venet. 1753. (t. 1. pp. 111 seqq.) Ed.]

[78] In Ezek. 1. p. 459. See before, s. 2. n. 46, preceding.

[79] Hom. 24. de Bapt. Christ. t. 1. p. 311. (t. 2. p. 369 d.).. Τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐχὶ ἡ ἡμέρα, καθ' ἣν ἐτέχθη, ἀλλ' ἡ ἡμέρα, καθ' ἣν ἐβαπτίσθη, Ἐπιφάνεια λέγεται; .... Ἐπειδὴ οὐχ ὅτε ἐτέχθη, τότε πᾶσιν ἐγένετο κατάδηλος· ἀλλ' ὅτε ἐβαπτίσατο· μέχρι γὰρ ταύτης ἠγνοεῖτο τῆς ἡμέρας τοῖς πολλοῖς. Καὶ ὅτι ἠγνόουν αὐτὸν οἱ πολλοὶ, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν ὅστίς ποτε ἦν, ἄκουσον τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ Ἰωάννου λέγοντος, Μέσος ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε· καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν, εἰ οἱ ἄλλοι ἠγνόουν, ὅπουγε καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ βαπτιστὴς αὐτὸν ἠγνόει ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης; Καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ, φησιν, οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον, καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτὸν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.

[80] Orat. 39. (t. 1. p. 624 b.) Ἡ γὰρ ἁγία τῶν φώτων ἡμέρα, εἰς ἣν ἀφίγμεθα, καὶ ἣν ἑορτάζειν ἠξιώμεθα σήμερον, ἀρχὴν μὲν τὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ Χριστοῦ βάπτισμα λαμβάνει, τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ φωτὸς, τοῦ φωτίζοντος πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

the baptism of Christ, "the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."' In like manner Gregory Nyssen intitles his Sermon on the Baptism of Christ[81], *A discourse on the day of lights, on which our Lord was baptized.* And Asterius Amasenus, speaking of the chief Christian festivals[82], says, 'We celebrate the Nativity, because at this time God manifested his divinity to us in the flesh. We celebrate the Feast of Lights, because by the remission of our sins [in baptism] we are brought, as it were, out of the dark prison of our former life, to a life of light and virtue.'

7. For baptism being generally called φῶς and φώτισμα, *light and illumination*, from the great and admirable effects consequent to it, this day, being the supposed day of our Saviour's baptism, was thereupon styled Ἡμέρα Φώτων, or Ἅγια Φῶτα, *the Day of Lights*, or *illumination* or *baptism*. As appears not only from the forementioned passages of Gregory Nazianzen and Nyssen, but from several other Greek writers noted by Suicerus[83], who justly reproves Xylander and Pamelius for interpreting this day of lights *Candlemas-day*, because now it is usual in the Church of Rome to consecrate their wax candles

[81] Orat. de Bapt. Christ. (t. 3. p. 366 d.) Titul. Εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν φώτων, ἐν ᾗ ἐβαπτίσθη ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν.

[82] Hom. 4. in Fest. Kalend. ap. Combefis. Auctar. Nov. (p. 68 d. 3.) Γενέθλια ἑορτάζομεν, ἐπειδὰν τὰ ἐν σαρκὶ θεοφάνια κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον ἔδειξεν ἡμῖν ὁ Θεός. Φῶτα πανήγυριν ἄγομεν, ἐπειδὰν τῇ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀφέσει, οἷον ἐκ σκοτεινοῦ τινὸς δεσμωτηρίου, τοῦ προτέρου βίου, πρὸς τὸν φωτεινὸν καὶ ἀνεύθυνον ἀναγόμεθα.

[83] Thes. Eccles. voce, Φῶς. (t. 2. p. 1487. n. 12.) Hinc dies baptismi Christi vocatur ἡμέρα τῶν φώτων a Gregorio Nazianzeno, Orat. 39. pag. 624. Ἡ ἁγία, κ. τ. λ. [See n. 79, preceding.] Ipsius orationis titulus est: Εἰς τὰ ἅγια φῶτα τῶν Ἐπιφανίων λόγος. Nicetas ad hæc: *Baptismus* LUMINUM *nomine appellatur, quod purget et illustret. Quo etiam fit, ut faces eo tempore in lætitiæ signum accendamus. Ac principium quidem et causa hujus festi, baptismus Christi est.* Id satis etiam perspicuum ex titulo Orationis Gregorii Nysseni in Baptismum Christi, tom. 3. pag. 366. [See n. 80, preceding.] Pantoleon hoc festum vocat Τὰ ἅγια φῶτα. Typicum: Εἴδησις τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ τῇ παραμονῇ τῶν ἁγίων φώτων. Cedrenus in Romano Læcapeno, pag. 509. Ῥωμανὸς δὲ, ταινιωθεὶς τῷ βασιλικῷ διαδήματι, στέφει κατ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν ἁγίων φώτων καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σύζυγον Θεοδώραν. Xylander in notis ad hunc locum: *Diem sacrorum luminum puto esse, quem alias Purificationis Mariæ vocant, Leichtmess.* Pamelius, in Epist. 34. Cypriani, num. 13. pag. 65. *Festum etiam, quod hodie Purificationis, olim, teste Beda,* Ὑπαπαντὴ *dicebatur, celebrat Homilia de Luminibus, sive Secundis Epiphaniis, D. Gregorius Nazianzenus.* Eadem aliorum etiam est sententia. Sed nihil minus. Purificatio enim Virginis, Græcis Ὑπαντὴ sive Ὑπαπαντὴ, secundo Februarii die celebratur: baptismi vero Christi festum, sexto Januarii, tam apud Græcos, quam Latinos celebratur, &c.

on this day, which is otherwise called *the Purification of the Virgin Mary;* whereas there was no such festival in use in the Church in the time of Gregory Nazianzen and Nyssen, nor many years after them, until the reign of Justinian[84], when it was first instituted by the Greek Church, under the name of *Hypapante.* And therefore when Nazianzen, in another place[85], brings in some giving this reason why they deferred their baptism; one saying, 'Μένω τὰ φῶτα, *I stay till the Feast of Lights come;*' another, 'that he had a greater respect for Easter;' and a third, 'that he waited till the time of Pentecost:' it is plain, the Feast of Lights cannot signify the Purification of the Virgin Mary, which was no solemn time of baptism, but Epiphany, on which the Greek Church allowed persons to be baptized, as one of the three solemn times of baptism, and that in regard to our Saviour's baptism, which they called[86] his *Second Nativity,* or *Second Epiphany,* when his divinity was more clearly manifested by the voice, which came from heaven, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased."

Celebrated as all other great festivals, and in one respect

8. So that we may observe, that in the Greek Church in one respect it was more taken notice of than even the Nativity itself; being allowed as one of the three solemn times of

[84] [Vid. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. voce, Ὑπαντὴ sive Ὑπαπαντή. (t. 2. p. 1374.) Institutum vero hoc festum sub Justiniano, &c.—See afterwards, ch. 8. s. 5. of this Book for a fuller account and for authorities. Ed.]

[85] Orat. 40. de Bapt. (t. 1. p. 654 a.) Τὸ καὶ τὸ σκήπτῃ, καὶ προφασίζῃ προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις· Μένω τὰ Φῶτα, τὸ Πάσχα μοι τιμιώτερον, τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν ἐκδέξομαι.

[86] Vid. Cotelerii Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 13. (vol. 1. p. 312. n. 30.) Epiphania divisa fuit in primam et secundam. *Duæ sunt autem Epiphaniæ,* ait Isidorus Originum, 6, 18: *prima, in qua natus Christus pastoribus Hebræorum angelo nuntiante apparuit: secunda, in qua ex Gentium populis stella indice præsepis cunabula Magos adoraturos exhibuit.* Cui partitioni suffragatur Ruffinus, dum Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationi 39. titulum facit, *De Secundis Epiphaniis,* in codice Divionensi, quem ad Virgilium Tapsensem laudat Chifletius, &c. [See Ruffin's Translation into Latin of Ten of Nazianzen's Orations, of which he himself speaks: (Hist. Eccles. l. 11. [al. 2.] c. 9. (p. 249 im.) Ex quibus nos denas.... oratiunculas transfudimus in Latinum. The Title of this rare book, which is exstant at the British Museum (862. i. 1.) in black letter, runs thus: Hi sunt in hoc codice libelli x Divi Gregorii Nazianzeni. Apologeticus, Liber 1. De Epiphaniis sive Natali Domini. De Luminibus, quod est De Secundis Epiphaniis. At the beginning (page not numbered): *Incipit de Luminibus, id est, de Secundis Theophaniis.* At the end: *Explicit de Luminibus, quod est, de Secundis Epiphaniis Sancti Gregorii.* Argentinæ, 1508. See the colophon. Ed.]

more noted, is being in the Greek Church one of the three solemn times of baptism.

baptism, which the Nativity was not. In the Latin Church indeed it wanted this privilege. For, as I have shown elsewhere[86], the Roman, French, and Spanish Churches for many ages would allow of no other solemn times of baptism but only Easter and Pentecost, except in case of sickness and extremity. But the Greek and African Churches made Epiphany also a day of baptism; as appears not only out of the forementioned place of Nazianzen, but also out of Victor Uticensis[87] and Johannes Moschus[88] and the ancient Ritual called *Typicum Sabæ*[89]. To which we may add what Chrysostom[90] says, 'that in this solemnity, in memory of our Saviour's baptism, by which he sanctified the nature of water, they were used at midnight to carry home water from the church, and lay it up, where it would remain as fresh and uncorrupt for one, two, or three years, as if it were immediately drawn out of any fountain. And Fronto Ducæus[91] observes the like custom in the Syriac Kalendar, published by Genebrard, upon this very day; which argues it to be a peculiar rite of the Eastern Church.

As to other things, the observation of this day was after the

[86] B. 11. ch. 6. s. 7. v. 4. p. 105

[87] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 2. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. p. 683 a. 14.) Dies enim Epiphaniorum lucescebat, &c.

[88] Pratum Spirit. c. 214. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 1170 ad calc.) .... In eo baptisterium est, quod in sanctis Epiphaniis sudat, &c.—See also b. 11. ch. 6. s. 7. v. 4. p. 110. n. 19., where Theodoret's citation of the *Typicum Monasterii Sancti Sabæ* is given. See also ibid. p. 111. n. 20.

[89] [St. Sabas flourished anno 484. See Cave, Hist. Liter. (Basil. 1741. t. 1. p. 457.) where thus: Scripsit Sabas in usum monasterii sui *Typicum*, sive *Ordinem recitandi officium ecclesiasticum per totum annum, capita* 59 *complectentem*, qui in omnibus monasteriis Hierosolymitanis mox obtinuit. Barbarorum incursionibus depravatum et pene deperditum Johannes Damascenus magno studio postea restituit et renovavit. Editum est hoc *Sabæ Typicum* inter alios Græcorum libros ecclesiasticos, &c. Fuse de eo agit Leo Allatius Dissertat. 1. de Libr. Eccles. Græcor. p. 5, &c.—See also in the *Typicum* published at Venice in the years 1603, 1615, 1643. Consult the Second of the *Three Dissertations* at the end of Cave, *De Libris et Officiis Ecclesiasticis*, ad calc. t. 2. Dissertat. p. 18. Ed.]

[90] Hom. 24. de Bapt. Christ. t. 1. p. 311. (t. 2. p. 369 d.) *Διά τοι τοῦτο καὶ μεσονυκτίῳ κατὰ τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην ἅπαντες ὑδρευσάμενοι οἴκαδε τὰ νάματα ἀποτίθενται, καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ὁλόκληρον φυλάττουσιν, ἅτε δὴ σήμερον ἁγιασθέντων τῶν ὑδάτων· καὶ τὸ σημεῖον γίνεται ἐναργές, οὐ διαφθειρομένης τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων ἐκείνων φύσεως τῷ μήκει τοῦ χρόνου, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν ὁλόκληρον καὶ δύο καὶ τρία πολλάκις ἔτη τοῦ σήμερον ἀντληθέντος ἀκεραίου καὶ νεαροῦ μένοντος, καὶ μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον τοῖς ἄρτι τῶν πηγῶν ἐξαρπασθεῖσιν ὕδασιν ἀμιλλωμένου.*

[91] In loc. p. 65. (Edit. Francofurt. 1699. t. 6. append. p. 46 a.) Nota veterem Christianorum morem, cujus vestigium etiamnum restat in Kalendario Syrorum apud Genebrardum 6. Januarii, *Ea nocte*, inquit, *aqua consecratur in totum annum.*

same manner as that of the Nativity and other great festivals. For they had sermons and the communion on this day, and servants had liberty to rest from their bodily labour to attend the religious service of the day. In regard to which usage the author of the Constitutions[92] gives this direction: 'Let servants rest from their labour on Epiphany, because on that day the divinity of Christ was declared, when the Father gave testimony to him at his baptism, and the Holy Ghost in the shape of a dove showed him to those that stood by, and heard the testimony that was given him.' And though at first this day was not exempt from juridical acts and prosecutions at law; nor were the public games and shows forbidden for some time to be exhibited thereon: yet at length Theodosius Junior[93] gave it an honourable place among those days, on which the public games should not be allowed; forasmuch as men ought to put a distinction between days of supplication and days of pleasure. And Justinian[94], reciting one of the laws of Theodosius the Great, makes both the Nativity and Epiphany days of vacation from all pleadings at law, as well as from popular pleasures. And so it is in the Laws of the Visigoths[95], published out of the body of the Roman laws by Reciswindus and other Gothic kings, and the old Gothic interpreter of the laws in the Theodosian Code[96]. From whence we may conclude, that this was become the standing rule and custom throughout both the Roman and the Visigoth dominions, to keep this festival of Epiphany with great veneration; neither allowing the courts to be open on this day for law, nor the theatre for pleasure.

9. I have but one thing more to note, as it were by the way, concerning this day: that they to whom the care of the Paschal cycle, or rule for finding out Easter, was committed, were

Notice usually given on Epiphany

[92] L. 8. c. 33. See before, s. 3. p. 285. the third part of n. 52, preceding.—Vid. l. 5. c. 13. See ibid. the second part of the same note.

[93] Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. See before, ch. 2. s. 4. p. 254. n. 9.

[94] Cod. l. 3. tit. 12. de Feriis, leg. 7. (t. 4. p. 608.) Dies etiam Natalis atque Epiphaniarum Christi, et quo tempore commemoratio Apostolicæ Passionis, totius Christianitatis magistræ, a cunctis jure celebratur: in quibus etiam prædictis sanctissimis diebus neque spectaculorum copiam reseramus.

[95] L. 2. tit. 1. leg. 11., citante Gothofredo ad Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 123. col. sinistr.) Idque ostendit, &c.

[96] L. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, in Interpret. legis 2. sub fin. (t. 1. p. 121.) Nec non et dies Natalis Domini nostri, vel Epiphaniæ, sine forensi strepitu volumus celebrari.

concerning the time of Easter in the ensuing year.

obliged on or about the time of Epiphany to give notice what time Easter and Lent and all the moveable solemnities were to be kept the ensuing year. The letters sent from the metropolitan to the provincial bishops upon this occasion are commonly called *Epistolæ Paschales* and *Heortasticæ*, *Paschal* and *Festival Epistles*, which are usually a short discourse upon some useful and important subject, closed with an intimation or notice of the day when Lent should begin, and of Easter-day, and Whitsunday. As those three Paschal Epistles of Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, which were translated by St. Jerom, and are now among St. Jerom's Works[94], and in the Bibliotheca Patrum[95]. Concerning which and the rest of the same kind, Cassian[96] says, 'It was an ancient custom in Egypt for the bishop of Alexandria, as soon as Epiphany was past, to send his circular letters to all the churches and monasteries of Egypt, to signify to them the beginning of Lent and Easter-day.' And there are some such of Dionysius, Athanasius, Cyril, Pope Innocent, and Leo[97]; and some orders of Councils[98], that the primates of Provinces should send their Circular Letters to give timely notice of these things to the

[94] [Juxt. Ed. Vallars. Veronæ, 1734. Epp. 96, 98, 100. t. 1. pp. 555, 577, 605. Ed.]

[95] Paris, 1654. t. 3. p. 79. (ap. Galland. t. 7. pp. 616, seqq.)

[96] Collat. 10. c. 2. (p. 383.) Intra Ægypti regionem mos iste antiqua traditione servatur, ut, peracto Epiphaniorum die,.. epistolæ pontificis Alexandrini per universas dirigantur ecclesias, quibus initium Quadragesimæ et dies Paschæ non solum per civitates, sed etiam per universa monasteria significentur.—Conf. Sozomen. l. 8. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 340. 15.) Καὶ Θεόφιλος δὲ ταύτης ἔχεσθαι τῆς δόξης ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεκελεύσατο, καὶ ἐν ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν ἐξ ἔθους περὶ τῆς Πασχαλίας ἑορτῆς ἔγραφε, καὶ ἀσώματον χρῆναι νοεῖν τὸν Θεὸν εἰσηγεῖτο, καὶ ἀνθρώπου σχήματος ἀλλότριον.

[97] Innocent. Ep. 11. (CC. t. 2. p. 1264 a.) De Ratione Paschali, &c.—Dionys. ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 20. (v. 1. p. 344. 12.).. Ἔτι καὶ τὰς φερομένας ἑορταστικὰς, κ. τ. λ.—Athanas. Ep. Heortast. (t. 1. part 2. p. 767.)—Cyril. Alexandr. Serm. 30. (t. 5. part 2. p. 257, seqq.)—Leo. Ep. 93. al. 95. ad Episcop. Gall. (CC. t. 3. p. 1819 d.) Cum in omnibus, &c.—Cod. Afric. c. 136. [al. 135.] (t. 2. p. 1143 b.) Τὰ γραφέντα, κ. τ. λ.

[98] C. Arelatens. 1. c. 1. (t. 1. p. 1427 c.) Primo loco de observatione Paschæ Dominicæ, ut uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem a nobis observetur, et juxta consuetudinem literas ad omnes tu dirigas.—C. Carth. 3. c. 1. (t. 2. p. 1167 c.) Placuit ergo in principio propter errorem, qui sæpe solet oboriri, ut omnes Africanæ provinciæ episcopi observationem Paschalem ab ecclesia Carthaginensi curent accipere.—C. 41. (ibid. p. 1173 d.) Adjicimus etiam de die Paschæ nobis esse mandatum, ut de ecclesia semper Carthaginensi ... instruamur, et non sub angusto temporis spatio.—C. Carth. 5. c. 7. (ibid. p. 1216 d.) Placuit, ut dies venerabilis Paschæ formatarum subscriptione omnibus intimetur.

several Churches under their jurisdiction. Particularly the fourth Council of Orleans [99], speaking of the time of keeping Easter uniformly by the Paschal *Laterculus*, or *Table*, made by Victorius, (Victor they call him,) say, 'The bishops of France shall every year on the day of Epiphany give notice of the time when the festival is to be kept in their churches. And if any doubt arise about the time, they shall have recourse to their metropolitan, and he to the apostolical see for resolution.' And this leads us to the consideration of the next great festival, which was that of Easter.

CHAP. V.

Of Easter, or the Paschal festival.

1. In speaking of the Paschal solemnity, I shall here only consider that part of it which was properly festival. For we are to know, the Ancients commonly included fifteen days in the whole solemnity of the Pasch, that is, the week before Easter Sunday, and the week following it: the one of which was called *Pascha σταυρώσιμον, the Pasch of the cross,* and the other, *Pascha ἀναστάσιμον, the Pasch of the resurrection.* Suicerus [1] will furnish the learned reader with examples of both. The general name *Pascha,* which is of Hebrew extract from *Pesach,* which signifies the *Passover,* will comprise both. For the Christian Passover includes as well the passion as the resurrection of our Saviour, who is the true Paschal Lamb, or Passover, that was sacrificed for us. And, therefore, though our English word, *Easter,* be generally used only to signify *the resurrection,* yet the ancient word, *Pascha,* was taken in a larger sense, to denote as well *the Pasch of the crucifixion,* as *the Pasch of the resurrection.*

The Paschal solemnity anciently reckoned fifteen days, the whole week before and the week after Easter Sunday.

And for this reason the Ancients commonly speak of the

[99] C. 1. (t. 5. p. 381 e.) Placuit ut sanctum Pascha secundum Laterculum Victoris ab omnibus sacerdotibus uno tempore celebratur. Quæ festivitas annis singulis ab episcopo Epiphaniarum die in ecclesiis denuntietur. De qua solemnitate quoties aliquid dubitatur, inquisita vel agnita per metropolitanos a sede apostolica sacra constitutio teneatur.—C. Antissiodor. in vocibus, Ἀναστάσις et Σταυρώσιμος, c. 2. (ibid. p. 957 e.) Ut omnes presbyteri ante Epiphaniam missos suos dirigant, qui eis de principio Quadragesimæ nuntient, et in ipsa Epiphania ad populum indicent.

[1] Thes. Eccles. (t. 1. p. 304, et t. 2. p. 1014.) vocibus, Ἀναστάσις et Σταυρώσιμος.

Pasch as containing fifteen days in its solemnity, including the week of the passion, together with that of the resurrection. Thus in one of the laws of Theodosius[2], where he decrees what days shall be days of vacation from all business of the law, he reckons into the number of them the holy days of the Pasch, seven going before, and seven following after. And Gothofred, in his learned commentary upon the place, says, 'that both Papianus in his Body of Laws[3], collected by him out of the Roman for the use of the Burgundians, and Anianus, in his Collection for the use of the Visigoths[4], keep to the same phrase of fifteen Paschal days.' To which we find also a plain reference made by St. Austin, in a sermon[5] preached by him on the *Dominica in Albis*, or *Sunday following Easter-day*, wherein he thus addresses himself to his audience: 'The days of vacation are now over, and those of convening, exactions, and lawsuits succeed in their room. Take care, my brethren, how ye spend these days. From the vacation of the foregoing days ye ought to learn meekness, not to meditate subtle devices: for some men rest on those days only to plot wickedness, which they may practise when the festival-days are over. We desire you may so live, as they that are to give account to God, not only of those fifteen days, but of their whole life.' And Scaliger[6] mentions a law of Constantine, wherein the Paschal weeks, the one before, the other after the Pasch, are ordered to be days of vacation from all proceedings at law. But because the former of these Paschal weeks belongs to the Lent-fast, we will consider it under that head, and here only speak of the Paschal solemnity as it was properly festival.

Great disputes in the Church

2. Now concerning this there were anciently very great disputes in the Church. Though all agreed in the observation of

[2] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 121.) Sanctos quoque Paschæ dies, qui septeno vel præcedunt numero, vel sequuntur, in eadem observatione numeramus.

[3] Lib. Responsor. tit. 12. (ibid. p. 124. col. sinistr.) Sed et Papianus, &c. Paschalibus etiam quindecim diebus.

[4] Leges Visigoth. l. 2. tit. 1. leg. 11. (ibid.)

[5] Serm. 19. ex 40. a Sirmond. edit. t. 10. p. 811. [al. Serm. 259.] (t. 5. p. 1064 b.) Peracti sunt dies feriati: succedent jam illi conventionum, exactionum, litigiorum,.... Petimus vos, ut ita vivatis, tanquam qui Deo rationem reddituros vos sciatis de tota vita, non de solis istis quindecim diebus.

[6] De Emendatione Temporum, l. 7. (p. 776 a. 6.) Τὰς Πασχαλίας δύο ἑβδομάδας ἀπράκτους τελεῖν, τήν τε πρὸ τοῦ Πάσχα καὶ τὴν μετ' αὐτό.

n general, yet they differed very much as to the particular ıe when it was to be observed; some keeping it precisely on ɜ same stated day every year, others on the fourteenth day the first moon in the new year, whatever day of the week at happened to fall upon: others deferring it to the first ınday after the first full moon; and those often differing in e Sunday on which they celebrated it by the difference and riety of their calculations. Epiphanius[7] says, some of the ıartadecimans in Cappadocia always kept their Pasch on the ghth of the Kalends of April, that is, the twenty-fifth of March, etending certain information from the Acts of Pilate, that that ıs the day of our Saviour's passion; yet other copies of those ɔts said the sixteenth [fifteenth] of the Kalends of April, at is, the seventeenth of March. The Christians of Gaul ɔo, till the time of Pope Victor, if Bede[8] may be credited, ıpt their Pasch always on the eighth of the Kalends of April, at is, the twenty-fifth of March, taking that to have been the ıy of our Saviour's resurrection. Bede cites the authority of ıeophilus, bishop of Cæsarea[9], and the Synod held under m for this. But considering that Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, ho lived in the time of Pope Victor, says no such thing of e French Churches, but the contrary, that they fixed their ıster to no certain day, but kept it as other Western hurches did, on the Sunday following the fourteenth day of e moon, it is more likely that Bede was imposed upon by me spurious Epistle of Theophilus and false Act of his Synod, hich charged the Gallican Churches with what they were not ally guilty of.

concerning this festival. Some observing it on a fixed day every year.

7 Hær. 50. Tessares. s. Quartacim. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 420 a.) *Ἕτεροι ἐξ αὐτῶν τὴν αὐτὴν μίαν ἡμέραν ιοντες, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν μίαν ἡμέραν στεύοντες, καὶ τὰ μυστήρια ἐπιτεῶντες, ἀπὸ τῶν Ἄκτων δῆθεν Πιλάυ αὐχοῦσι τὴν ἀκρίβειαν εὑρηκέναι, οἷς ἐμφέρεται, τῇ πρὸ ὀκτὼ Καλαν-ιν Ἀπριλλίων τὸν Σωτῆρα πεπονθέ-ι· καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ βούλονται ειν τὸ Πάσχα, ὁποίᾳ δ' ἂν ἐμπέσῃ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτῃ τῆς σελήνης . . . τι δὲ εὕρομεν ἀντίγραφα ἐκ τῶν Πιίτου, ἐν οἷς σημαίνει πρὸ δεκαπέντε Καλανδῶν Ἀπριλλίων τὸ πάθος γεγενῆσθαι.*

8 De Ratione Temporum, c. 45. (t. 2. p. 89.) Nam Galli quacunque die 8 Kalend. Aprilis fuisset, quando Christi resurrectio fuisse tradebatur, Pascha semper celebrabant.

9 De Æquinoctio Vernali. t. 3. p. 232. See before, ch. 4. s. 4. p. 286. n. 57. [See the *Fragmentum super Quæstione Paschali* in Gallandius, t. 2. p. 162. This Theophilus flourished about the year 196. Ed.]

Others observing it, with the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the moon, whatever day of the week that happened upon.

3. However, we are sure that in the second century there happened a great dispute between the Asiatic Churches and the rest of the world concerning this day. Pope Pius[10], who lived about the year 147, had made a decree that the annual solemnity of the Pasch should be kept only on the Lord's-day; and, in confirmation of this, he pretended 'that Hermes, his brother,' who was then an eminent teacher among them, 'had received instruction from an angel, who commanded that all men should keep the Pasch on the Lord's-day.' Yet, notwithstanding this, the Asiatics kept to their ancient custom, and Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome to confer with Anicetus upon it. They could come to no agreement upon the time; for Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp[11] to alter a custom which he had observed with St. John the Apostle, and the rest of the Apostles of the Lord, with whom he had lived and familiarly conversed. Neither could Polycarp persuade Anicetus to recede from a custom which he had received from the elders that were before him. Yet they continued to communicate with each other, and Anicetus did Polycarp the honour to let him consecrate the eucharist in his church: and so they parted from each other in peace; all Churches, as well those that observed it on the Lord's-day as those that did not, still agreeing to preserve Christian peace and communion one with another.

Not long after the death of Polycarp, the controversy was revived again at Laodicea, upon which Melito, bishop of Sardis, wrote his two books *De Paschate*, wherein he defended the opinion of the Asiatics; as is evident from the testimony and character which not long after Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus,

[10] Pii Ep. I. (CC. t. I. p. 562 a.) .... Hermæ angelus Domini in habitu pastoris apparuit, et præcepit ei, ut Pascha die Dominico ab omnibus celebraretur.

[11] Ep. ad Victor. ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (v. I. p. 249. 5.) Οὔτε γὰρ ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὸν Πολύκαρπον πεῖσαι ἐδύνατο μὴ τηρεῖν, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου, τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἀποστόλων, οἷς συνδιέτριψεν, ἀεὶ τετηρηκότα· οὔτε μὲν ὁ Πολύκαρπος τὸν Ἀνίκητον ἔπεισε τηρεῖν, λέγοντα τὴν συνήθειαν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πρεσβυτέρων ὀφείλειν κατέχειν· καὶ τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων, ἐκοινώνησαν ἑαυτοῖς· καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παρεχώρησεν ὁ Ἀνίκητος τὴν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ Πολυκάρπῳ κατ' ἐντροπὴν δηλονότι, καὶ μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἀπηλλάγησαν.—[The Fragments of Melito are to be found in the second part of the first volume of the Bibliotheca Maxima, as well as in Gallandius, t. I. p. 677. Ed.]

gives of him. For when the dispute was set on foot again by the fierceness of Pope Victor, Polycrates[12] wrote to him, and told him, 'they observed the Pasch on the fourteenth day of the moon, as it had been kept and handed down to them by St. Philip the Apostle who died at Hierapolis, by St. John the Apostle who died at Ephesus, by Polycarp bishop of Smyrna, by Thraseas the martyr, bishop of Eumenia, by Sagarias the martyr, bishop of Laodicea, by Papirius, by Melito bishop of Sardis, and by many others, whose custom was to celebrate the Pasch on the same day that the Jews were wont to put away their leaven.' This did not satisfy Pope Victor, but he, in a great paroxysm of intemperate zeal, immediately excommunicated all the Asiatic Churches, and sent his Circular Letters to all Churches that were of his opinion, that they should hold no communion with them. But this rash and bold act of his was ill resented by all wise and sober men of his own party, several of whom wrote sharply to him, advising him rather to take such measures and resolutions as were proper to preserve charity, unity, and peace among the Churches. Particularly Irenæus[13], whose nature, by what the Greeks call *pheronymy*, corresponded to his name, being of an *irenical* or *pacific* temper, wrote to him in the name of the Church of Gaul, and in a decent manner admonished him 'not to excommunicate whole Churches of God for observing an ancient custom, which they had received by tradition from their ancestors: forasmuch as that there had been disputes of old in the Church, not only about the day, but about the manner of the fast preceding it; some fasting one, some two, some more days; yet all these kept peace one with another, as we now do, and the difference in the manner of fasting only commended their unanimity in the faith.' He added, 'that Polycarp and Anicetus, though they could not agree upon the point, yet parted friends, and continued to communicate with

[12] Ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (v. 1. p. 243. 14.) Ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀραδιούργητον ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν, κ. τ. λ.

[13] [Ap. Euseb. ibid. (p. 245. 21.) Οὐδὲ γὰρ μόνον περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐστὶν ἡ ἀμφισβήτησις, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους αὐτοῦ τῆς νηστείας. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἴονται μίαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτοὺς νηστεύειν· οἱ δὲ δύο· οἱ δὲ καὶ πλείονας· οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν. Καὶ τοιαύτη μὲν ποικιλία τῶν ἐπιτηρούντων, οὐ νῦν ἐφ' ἡμῶν γεγονυῖα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν· .... Καὶ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον πάντες οὗτοι εἰρήνευσάν τε, καὶ εἰρηνεύομεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· καὶ ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηστείας τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πίστεως συνίστησι. *Grischov.*]

each other, notwithstanding this difference,' as has been related before.

Athanasius[14] also tells us further, that the Churches of Cilicia, Mesopotamia, and Syria, were in the same sentiments with the Asiatic Churches in his time: though it is a dispute between Bishop Usher[15] and Valesius[16], whether they were so originally; for Valesius will not allow that they were so in the time of Pope Victor. However, we see there were many great and famous Churches which kept their Pasch on the fourteenth day of the moon, with the Jews, and that as a custom received by tradition from St. Philip and St. John the Apostles. Neither were they induced by the menaces of Pope Victor to alter their custom, but continued it to the time of the Council of Nice, anno 324. About which time, Constantine being very desirous to compose this difference in the Church, sent Hosius, bishop of Corduba, first into the East, as Sozomen[17] relates, to

[14] Ep. ad African. tit. 1. p. 933. (t. 1. part. 2. p. 713 b.) *Οἱ κατὰ Συρίαν, καὶ Κιλικίαν, καὶ Μεσοποταμίαν διεφώνουν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν ᾧ ποιοῦσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐποίουν καὶ αὐτοί.*—De Synod. Arimin. et Seleuc. p. 872. (ibid. p. 574 e. n. 5.) *Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς Συρίας, καὶ Κιλικίας, καὶ Μεσοποταμίας ἐχώλευον περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν, καὶ μετὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐποίουν τὸ Πάσχα.*

[15] De Epistolis Ignat. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 204.) Admisso autem ab omnibus communiter Judaico isto calculo; alii Pascha *σταυρώσιμον* die primo azymorum, in quamcunque septimanæ feriam ille incidisset, lugendo et jejunando observabant; eoque transacto jejunium solvebant, ut ex Chrysostomi oratione intelligimus, adversus eos habita, qui primo Pascha jejunabant: alii jejunium usque ad proximam Dominicam continuantes, in ea Pascha *ἀναστάσιμον* cum gaudio et festivitate celebrabant. Prior consuetudo, in ecclesiis non solum Asiæ proprie dictæ, quod ex controversia, cum eis hac de re a Victore Romano episcopo habita, notum est, sed etiam Syriæ, Mesopotamiæ, et Ciliciæ, ut ex Athanasii Libro de Synodis et Epistola ad Africanos colligitur, obtinuit: posterior in Romana, Alexandrina, et aliis ecclesiis est recepta, &c.

[16] In Euseb. l. 5. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 242. n. 2.) Jacobus Usserius in Prolegomenis ad Ignatii Epistolas, c. 9. scribit, Asianos, qui primo azymorum die cum Judæis Pascha celebrabant, eum diem cum luctu ac jejunio transegisse, eoque demum transacto jejunium Quadragesimale solvisse. Verum huic sententiæ refragatur Eusebius, qui diserte affirmat Asianos die 14. primi mensis, quamvis non esset Dominica, finem statuisse Quadragesimæ. Quod vero Usserius affert Chrysostomi testimonium, meo quidem judicio ejus sententiam nihil adjuvat. Nam Chrysostomus in Oratione illa *Adversus eos qui primo Pascha jejunant*, invehitur adversus quosdam Quartadecimanos, qui 14. lunæ cum Judæis Pascha celebrabant, eoque die jejunabant ac mysteria celebrabant; id enim proprium erat Quartadecimanorum, ut in eorum hæresi tradit Epiphanius. Verum priscos Asianos ita fecisse, nec Chrysostomus, nec alius quisquam dixit.

[17] L. 1. c. 16. (v. 2. p. 34. 22.) *Νομίσας τε δύνασθαι προκαταλαβεῖν τὸ κακὸν, πρὶν εἰς πλείους χωρῆσαι,*

try if he could bring the dissenting party to an unanimity with the rest of their brethren. But failing of his design, he afterwards proposed the matter to the Council of Nice, where a decree was made, that the holy feast of the Pasch should be kept on one and the same day by all, as appears from one of Constantine's Epistles to the Bishops who came not to the Synod, which is recorded by all the historians[18]. Not long after this the Council of Antioch[19], anno 341, made a more peremptory decree, that all who presumed to disannul the determination made by the holy and great Council of Nice concerning the Paschal festival, should be excommunicated and cast out of the Church, if they persisted contentiously to oppose what was there decreed. The like canons had been made several times before; but none so peremptory as this.

Eusebius[20] mentions abundance of synods in the time of Pope Victor, which determined with him that the Resurrection-pasch ought only to be kept on the Lord's-day; but they did not excommunicate any that opposed them; but rather, as Sozomen[21] relates, mutually tolerated one another in their different observations. The first Council of Arles likewise[22], be-

πέμπει ἄνδρα τὸν ἀμφ' αὐτὸν πίστει καὶ βίῳ ἐπίσημον, καὶ ταῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ δόγματος ὁμολογίαις ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν χρόνοις εὐδοκιμηκότα, διαλλάξοντα τοὺς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διὰ τὸ δόγμα στασιάζοντας, καὶ τοὺς πρὸς ἕω περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν διαφερομένους· ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ὅσιος ὁ Κορδούβης ἐπίσκοπος.

[18] Theodor. l. 1. c. 10. (v. 3. p. 34.) Πεῖραν λαβὼν, κ. τ. λ.—Socrat. l. 1. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 32. 12.) Πεῖραν λαβὼν, κ. τ. λ. — Sozom. l. 1. c. 21. (ibid. p. 40. 16.) Καὶ ἄλλας δὲ κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιστολὰς διεπέμψατο, κ. τ. λ. — [Conf. ibid. c. 25. (p. 42. 43.) Δῆλα δὲ ποιῶν καὶ τοῖς μὴ παροῦσι τὰ ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ κατωρθωμένα, κ. τ. λ. Ed.]—Euseb. de Vit. Constant. l. 3. c. 14. (v. 1. p. 585. 4.) Ὡς ὁμόφωνον, κ. τ. λ.

[19] [In Encæniis,] c. 1. (t. 2. p. 561 a.) Πάντας τοὺς τολμῶντας παραλύειν τὸν ὅρον τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης συνόδου, τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συγκροτηθείσης ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ τῆς εὐσεβείας τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου, περὶ τῆς ἁγίας ἑορτῆς τοῦ σωτηριώδους Πάσχα, ἀκοινωνήτους καὶ ἀποβλήτους εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, εἰ ἐπιμένοιεν φιλονεικότερον ἐνιστάμενοι πρὸς τὰ καλῶς δεδογμένα.

[20] L. 5. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 242. 11.) Σύνοδοι καὶ συνκροτήσεις ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ τ' αὐτὸν ἐγίνοντο· πάντες τε μιᾷ γνώμῃ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν δόγμα τοῖς πανταχόσε διετυποῦντο, ὡς ἂν μὴ δ' ἐν ἄλλῃ ποτὲ τῆς Κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ τὸ τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως ἐπιτελοῖτο τοῦ Κυρίου μυστήριον.

[21] L. 7. c. 19. (v. 2. p. 306. 25.) Ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ πρὸς δύσιν ἱερεῖς οὐκ ᾤοντο δεῖν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου τὴν παράδοσιν ἀτιμάζειν· οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Εὐαγγελιστῇ ἀκολουθεῖν ἰσχυρίζοντο· τοῦτο κοινῇ δόξαν, ἕκαστοι ὡς εἰώθεσαν ἑορτάζοντες, τῆς πρὸς σφᾶς κοινωνίας οὐκ ἐχωρίσθησαν· εὔηθες γὰρ καὶ μάλα δικαίως ὑπέλαβον, ἐθῶν ἕνεκεν ἀλλήλων χωρίζεσθαι, περὶ τὰ καίρια τῆς θρησκείας συμφωνοῦντες.

[22] C. 1. See before, ch. 4. s. 9. p. 298. n. 98.

fore the Council of Nice, anno 314, had given in charge, that the Pasch of the Lord's resurrection should be observed *uno die et tempore per omnem orbem, at one time and on one and the same day throughout all the world.* But they added no such penalty of excommunication to be inflicted on those that observed the contrary custom. The only rule which pressed the observation with severity was one of the Apostolical Canons[23], supposed to be made by some Eastern Council about the time of Pope Victor, which says, 'If any presbyter or deacon keep the day of the holy Pasch before the vernal equinox with the Jews, let him be deposed.' Yet this at most only affected the clergy. But when the great Council of Nice had once undertaken to determine this matter, such a deference was thought proper to be paid to her decree, as that it was reputed a schismatical act, and worthy of ecclesiastical censure, for any one to oppose it. And therefore from this time the opposers of the decree are commonly censured either as heretics or schismatics, as may be seen in the Canons of Laodicea[24], and the first Council of Constantinople[25], and the accounts which St. Austin[26] and Epiphanius[27] give of the ancient heretics, where they are condemned under the names of *Quartadecimani*, and *Tessarescœdecatitæ*, and *Audiani*, with a particular reason given for their condemnation. For St. Austin[28] notes out of Epiphanius, 'that the Audians were condemned not so much for their opinion in this point, as for their pervicaciousness in making a disturbance and schism in the Church

[23] C. 8. [al. 7.] (Cotel. [c. 5.] v. 1. p. 437.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος τὴν ἁγίαν τοῦ Πάσχα ἡμέραν πρὸ τῆς ἐαρινῆς ἰσημερίας μετὰ Ἰουδαίων ἐπιτελέσει, καθαιρείσθω.

[24] C. 7. (t. 1. p. 1497 a.) Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἐκ τῶν αἱρέσεων, τοῦτ' ἔστι, Ναυατιανῶν, ἤτοι Φωτεινιανῶν, ἢ Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατιτῶν, ἐπιστρεφομένους, κ. τ. λ.

[25] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 a.) Ἀρειανοὺς μὲν καὶ Μακεδονιανοὺς .... καὶ τοὺς Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατίτας, κ. τ. λ.

[26] De Hæres. c. 29. (t. 8. p. 10 e.) —Ibid. c. 50. (ibid. 18 b.) Vadianos, quos appellat Epiphanius, &c. [Vid. Annot. Ed. Bened. in loc. (p. ead.) Floriacensis Codex hoc tantum loco habebat *Adianos:* nam supra in Indiculo operi præfixo cum cæteris MSS. præfert *Vadianos.* Prædestinus in Augiensi Codice *Valdianos* constanter vocat, iis duobus locis, quibus Sirmondus *Audianos* edidit. Græcis revera dicuntur Αὐδιανοί. Ed.]

[27] De Hæres. 30. [al. 50.] Quartadec. (t. 1. p. 419 c.) and Hær. 70. Audian. See n. 29, following.

[28] De Hæres. c. 50. (ibid. p. 18 c.) Eos autem separasse se, dicit Epiphanius, a communione nostra, culpando episcopos divites, et Pascha cum Judæis celebrando.

upon it. For 'they would not hold any communion with their own bishops, nor with any that did not keep the Pasch at the same time that the Jews did.' Epiphanius[29] gives a large account of them, and says, 'they railed at the Council of Nice for introducing a new custom in compliance with Constantine's humour, and made a separation in the Church; upon which Constantine banished Audius their leader into Gothia or Scythia, because he drew many away from the Church into a separate communion.'

The case was now very different from what it was in the time of Pope Anicetus and Victor, when Polycarp and Polycrates kept their Pasch at a different time from the rest of the world, but still made no division in the Church, but lived in peace and communion with those that differed from them. And this no doubt was the reason why the Audians, or new Quartadecimans, were treated with such severity both by the Church and State above the old ones, because they pervicaciously carried their dissent into a schism, and made a formal rupture in the communion of the Church. And for this reason the imperial laws were often very severe upon them. Theodosius the Great, in one of his laws[30], ranks them with the Manichees, forbidding their conventicles, confiscating their goods, rendering them intestate, and liable also to capital punishment. In like manner, Theodosius Junior[31] ranks the Sabbatians and Protopaschitæ, which were new denominations of the Quartadecimans, taken up in his time, among the Manichees, Cataphrygians or Montanists, Arians, Macedonians, Eunomians, Novatians, and makes them all liable to the same general punishments inflicted by the laws. And more parti-

[29] Hær. 70. Audian. n. 9. (t. 1. p. 821 a.) *Φάσκοντες ἀπὸ Κωνσταντίου* [lege, *Κωνσταντίνου*. Petav. in marg.] *διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα φησὶ προσωποληψίαν καταλελοίπατε τὴν τῶν πατέρων περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα ἑορτῆς ἀκολουθίαν, καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν μετηλλάξατε εἰς τὸ καθῆκον τοῦ βασιλέως.*—[Ibid. n. 14. (p. 827 a.) *Ὑπέστη δὲ καὶ ἐξορίαν αὐτὸς ὁ γέρων Αὔδιος εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Σκυθίας, ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐξορισθεὶς διὰ τὸ ἀφηνιάζειν λαοὺς, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνενέχθη.* Ed.]—Vide Chrysostom. Hom. 52. In eos, qui Pascha jejunant. t. 5. p. 706. [Ed. Bened. Cont. Judæos, Hom. 3.] (t. 1. p. 609 b.) *Τριακόσιοι πατέρες, ἢ καὶ πλείους, εἰς τὴν Βιθυνῶν χώραν συνελθόντες, ταῦτα ἐνομοθέτησαν· καὶ πάντας ἀτιμάζεις ἐκείνους; κ. τ. λ.*

[30] Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 5. de Hæreticis, leg. 9. (t. 6. p. 124.)... Quicunque in unum Paschæ diem non obsequenti religione convenerint, tales indubitanter, quales hac lege damnavimus, habeantur.

[31] Ibid. leg. 59. (p. 182.) Manichæi et Phryges .... Ariani itidem, Macedonianique et Eunomiani, &c.

cularly in two other laws[32], he styles them 'execrable men, who, being a spawn of the Novatians, were not content to be in the common herd, but set up a new sect called *Protopaschites*, because they kept the Pasch *before* other Christians, and pretended that their way was the true primitive and original institution.' These he condemns 'to be both confiscated and banished,' and says 'they deserved a more severe punishment, because they exceeded other heretics in madness, worshipping in a manner another Christ, by keeping the Pasch at another time, and after a different manner than all orthodox Christians.'

I remember no other place at present that mentions the Protopaschites by name but only this law; but it is plain they were one of the worst sort of Quartadecimans, who had made a new separation from the Novatian schismatics upon this question about the Paschal festival. For some of the Novatians in one of their synods at Pazus, in Phrygia, had made a decree, mentioned by Socrates[33], that Easter ought to be kept with the Jews, which occasioning a new dispute among them, (for the old Novatians at Rome and Constantinople were of a different opinion,) Marcianus, the Novatian bishop of Constantinople, called another synod at Angarus, in Bithynia, where to end the controversy and lay it asleep they made a new canon, called the *ἀδιάφορον*, which was, that the matter should

[32] Cod. Theod. lib. 16. tit. 6. Ne sanctum baptisma iteretur, leg. 6. (t. 6. p. 200.) Illud etiam, quod a retro principibus dissimulatum, et in injuriam sacræ legis ab execrandis hominibus agitatur, et ab iis potissimum, qui Novatianorum collegio desertores et refugæ, auctores se quam potiores [al. portiones] memoratæ sectæ haberi contendunt, quibus ex crimine nomen est, cum se Protopaschitas appellari desiderent, inultum esse non patimur. Sed si alio die Novatiani, quam quo Orthodoxorum antistites prædicandum ac memorabilem in sæculis diem Paschæ duxerint celebrandum, auctores illius conventionis deportatio pariter ac proscriptio subsequatur: contra quos etiam acrior pœna fuerat promulganda: si quidem hoc delictum etiam hæreticorum vesaniam superet, qui alio tempore, quam quo Orthodoxi, Paschæ festivitatem observantes, alium pene Dei filium, non quem colimus, venerantur.—Ibid. tit. 10. de Paganis, leg. 24. (p. 295.) .... Eos, qui omnibus hæreticis hac una sunt persuasione pejores, quod in venerabili die Paschæ ab omnibus dissentiunt, si in eadem amentia perseverant, eadem pœna mulctamus, bonorum proscriptione atque exsilio.

[33] L. 4. c. 28. (v. 2. p. 251. 2.)... *Σύνοδον γὰρ Πάζῳ κώμῃ, ἔνθα τοῦ Σαγγαρίου ποταμοῦ εἰσιν αἱ πηγαὶ, ποιήσαντες ὀλίγοι τινὲς καὶ οὐκ εὔσημοι τῶν περὶ Φρυγίαν Ναυατιανῶν ἐπίσκοποι, ὅρον ἐκφέρουσιν, ὥστε Ἰουδαίους ἐπιτηρεῖν, ποιοῦντας τὰ Ἄζυμα, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τὴν τοῦ Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖν ἑορτήν.*

be *indifferent,* and that both parties might keep the feast their own way, and not break communion upon it. But Sabbatius, a fierce man among them, would not yield to this, but said[34] the decree of the synod of Pazus ought to be observed, and that the Pasch ought to be observed after the manner of the Jews. And upon this he made a new separation among the Novatians, and headed the Protopaschites, who from him were called Sabbatians.

It appears also from Chrysostom[35] that these Protopaschites were gone further into the Jewish notions about the Pasch than the rest of the Quartadecimans; for they asserted, that it was necessary to observe the Jewish *Azyma,* and keep the fast as the Jews did when the Pasch was over. For Sabbatius himself was originally a Jew, and retained a tincture of Judaism when he professed the Christian religion, as Socrates notes in the forementioned place. So they kept a feast with the Jews, when the Christians fasted on the Passion-day, (as Chrysostom[36] charges them,) and fasted on Easter-day, when the Christians kept their festival in memory of the resurrection.

This, as far as I can collect, is the true history of the progress which the new Quartadeciman schism made after the Council of Nice, and the reason why the laws, both imperial and ecclesiastical, proceeded with greater severity against them above the old Quartadecimans, who never broke communion with their brethren, however they differed from them in their practice. They thought the peace and unity of the Church of greater value than the observation of times and seasons; and if they could not comply with their brethren in the precise time of keeping Easter, yet they were careful for all that to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

They who kept it on the Lord's-day did

4. Besides this difference about keeping Easter on the Lord's-day, there was another, which though of less moment, yet sometimes very much embarrassed and troubled the

[34] Ibid. l. 5. c. 21. (p. 289. 35.) *Σαββάτιος ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων Χριστιανίσας κ. τ. λ.*

[35] Hom. 52. In eos, qui Pascha jejunant. t. 5. p. 713. [Ed. Bened. Cont. Judæos, Hom. 3.] (t. 1. p. 601 a.) ..... *Τοῦτο ἀκούω λεγόντων πολλῶν, ὅτι μετὰ τοῦ Ἀζύμου τὸ Πάσχα ἔστιν.*

[36] Ibid. p. 714. (p. 611 e.) *Οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὸ Πάσχα νηστεύομεν, οὐδὲ διὰ τὸν σταυρὸν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τὰ ἡμέτερα, ἐπειδὴ μέλλομεν μυστηρίοις προσιέναι· ἐπεὶ τόγε Πάσχα οὐ νηστείας ἐστὶν, οὐδὲ πένθους, ἀλλ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ χαρᾶς ὑπόθεσις.*

ılways
ɜ to fix
ı the
ɔ
l's-day,
eason
ıeir dif-
ıt cal-
ıions.

Church. That was a dispute among those who agreed to observe the festival on no other but the Lord's-day. For though they all unanimously combined in this, yet it was not so easy to determine on what Lord's-day it was to be held, because it was a moveable feast; and therefore sometimes it happened, that the Churches of one country kept it a week or a month sooner than others, by reason of their different calculations. It appears from an Epistle of St. Ambrose[37], that, in the year 387, Easter was kept at three several times: some observing it, March 21; others, April 18; and others, April 25. So it happened again, anno 577: the Churches of Gaul kept it on March 21; the Churches of Italy on April 18; and the Churches of Egypt on April 25; as Bishop Stillingfleet[38] shows out of Gregory of Tours and Labbe's *Chronologicon Technicum*, anno 387 and 577. Where he shows further, out of the ancient *Laterculus Paschalis* published by Bucherius[39], that the Easter of the Latins was, three times, a month

[37] Ep. 83. [al. 23.] De Pasch. Celebrand. Ration. (t. 2. pp. 880 e, seqq.) Non mediocris esse sapientiæ, &c.

[38] Answer to Cressy, [ch. 4. s. 12.] p. 323. (v. 5. p. 692.) .... It appears by the ancient *Laterculus Paschalis*, first published by Bucherius ..... that within the compass of it, viz. a hundred years, the Easter of the Latins was kept a month sooner than the Alexandrians, viz. A.D. 322, 349, 406. And A.D. 387, a threefold Easter was kept, some March 21, others April 25, others April 18, as appears by St. Ambrose's Epistle, written on that occasion. Again, A.D. 577, a threefold Easter was kept: some keeping it the eighteenth of April, as those which followed Victorius; others, the twenty-fifth of April, viz. those which followed the Alexandrian Canon; and others again, even in Gaul, as Gregory Turonensis saith, on the 12th Kal. of April, March 21, the very day of the vernal equinox, &c.

[39] Comment. in Hippol. Canon. Paschal. p. 264. (Antwerp. 1633. p. 64.) Hic est Paschalis ille centum annorum Laterculis, quo vetustiorem, Latinorum quidem, nondum videre contigit; nobilissimum, meo quidem sensu, venerandæ antiquitatis ecclesiasticæ monimentum. Et est illius epocha sane perillustris; nempe a Maxentio, crucis virtute per Constantinum debellato, assertaque tum primum ecclesiæ, saltem in Occidente, libertate, annis ante Nicænam Synodum omnino tredecim. Qui ejus meminerit, neminem veterum adhuc invenies: vetustissimæ tantum membranæ beneficio ad nos usque pervenit. Cuspiniano quoque in manus obvenisse, ex ejus Fastis intelligimus, ut supra monui. Porro Latinorum potius, quam aliorum fuisse, docet nos ipsa Paschatum series. Nam cum iis solis ter Pascha planissime decernit, toto mense, quam Victorius et Alexandrini, maturius. Semel anno Christi 322, iterum 349, denique 406; et limes ipse patrum Cæsariensium Paschalis, qui nunquam hic violatur, nunquam jam inde ab Synodo Nicæna ab Alexandrinis, sed Latinorum duntaxat nonnullis admissus, his potius, quam illis astruit.

sooner than that of the Alexandrians, within the compass of an hundred years, viz. anno 322, 349, 406. It appears also from Leo's Epistles[40], that in the year 455 there were eight days' difference between the Easter at Rome and at Alexandria. Cyril of Alexandria, in one of his Paschal Epistles[41], complains,

[40] Ep. 64. ad Marcian. (CC. t. 3. p. 1355 c.) ..... Theophilus, Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ episcopus, cum hujus observationis annos centum numero collegisset, septuagesimo sexto Paschale festum longe aliter, quam alii decreverant, tenendum esse constituit, a primo augustæ memoriæ Theodosii Senioris consulatu [nempe, A. Ch. 380.] succedentes sibi sacræ observantiæ ordines ponens: ut longioris temporis ratio ejus literis teneretur ascripta, cujus complexionis septuagesimus et quartus est annus, in qua pridie Idus Aprilis sanctum Pascha celebravimus: sequenti vero anno pridie Nonas Aprilis eadem, propitio Deo, erit habenda festivitas, sicut regulariter centenariæ annorum rationis ordo declarat. Sed in anno, qui erit septuagesimus sextus [Christi 455] Paschæ dies invenietur ascriptus, quem a passione Domini nullius exempli constitutionis admittit auctoritas. Nam diem octavum Kalendarum Maiarum ab eo cognoscimus præfinitum, qui anni limitem antiquitus constitutum excedit: cum alii quinto decimo Kalendarum Maiarum huic festivitati deputaverint diem, &c.—Augustin. Ep. 65. ad Eudocium. (ibid. p. 1356 c.) ... Annus, qui erit septuagesimus sextus [Christi 455] memorati episcopi [Theophili Alexandrini] annotationem habere cognoscitur, quæ a totius antiquitatis exemplo et ab omni auctoritate patrum discordat. Siquidem in octavum Kalendarum Maiarum Dominicum Pascha transtulerit, præfinitos antiquitatis limites nimis audenter excedens, cum die quinto decimo Kalendarum Maiarum Paschalem solemnitatem potuerit annotare.—Ep. 95. ad Episcopos Galliæ et Hispaniæ. (ibid. p. 1419 e.) .... Cum autem, in quibusdam ascriptionibus patrum, futurum proxime Pascha Domini, ab aliis in diem 15. Kalendas Maias, ab aliis in diem 8. Kalendas easdem inveniretur ascriptum, tantum me diversitas ista permovit, ut clementissimo principi Marciano curam de hac re animi mei panderem, &c.

[41] Ep. Paschal. ap. Bucher. de Doctrina Temporum. append. p. 482. Cum his igitur atque hujusmodi dissensionibus per universum orbem Paschalis Regula turbaretur; sanctorum totius orbis synodi consensione decretum est, ut quoniam apud Alexandriam talis esset reperta ecclesia, quæ in hujus scientia clareret, quota Kalendarum vel Iduum, quota luna Pascha debeat celebrari, per singulos annos Romanæ ecclesiæ literis intimaret; unde apostolica auctoritate universalis ecclesia per totum orbem definitum Paschæ diem sine ulla disceptatione cognosceret. Quod cum per multa sæcula pariter custodissent; nullamque inde Scripturarum quispiam crederet, ubi nulla quæstio solveretur; et nonnunquam occurreret, ut in Sabbato luna 21., quæ illis 23. a quinto decimo Kalendarum Maiarum, usque in octavum, quasi in secundo mense Pascha celebrare metueretur; essetque magna confusio in omni ecclesia, prætorio, vel palatio; Theodosius, imperator religiosissimus, qui non solum in humanis, verum etiam in divinis legibus placere Deo semper studuit, sanctum Theophilum, Alexandrinæ urbis episcopum, suis literis corrogavit, ut sacramentum Paschæ evidentissima ratione disserere, sibique dirigere, dignaretur. Cujus sanctissimis præceptis obtemperans quadringentorum octodecim annorum Circulum Paschalem instituit, ejusque clementiæ, a primo anno consulatus ejus, usque ad centum calculans, quota Kalendarum vel Iduum, et quota luna Pascha debeat celebrari, subjectis suis literis desti-

that there was great confusion in the account of Easter both in the church, the camp, and the palace. And Anatolius, in his preface to his Paschal Canon[42], complains, that there were very different and contrary cycles in use in his time, (anno 270,) some following Hippolytus's cycle of sixteen, others the Jewish cycle of eighty-four, others a cycle of twenty-five, others a cycle of thirty. And he tells us, that Isidore, Jerom, Clemens, and Origen, all his countrymen, Egyptians, had laboured in this matter before him. But notwithstanding any endeavours that could be used then, or afterwards, there remained great differences in the Church about it for many ages. For the Churches of Great Britain and Ireland did not accord with the Roman Church in keeping Easter on the same Sunday, till about the year 800. Nor was the Roman way fully received in France, till it was settled there by the authority of Charles the Great: as has lately been shown by two learned writers, Bishop Stillingfleet[43] and Dr. Prideaux[44], who give a

navit, manifestamque veritatem sub libello breviter perstrinxit. In quo, revelante sibi Domino, perfectæ rationis ordinem pandit, omnesque errores, ac superfluas quæstiones luce clarius expugnavit atque dissolvit.

[42] Canon. Paschal. ap. Bucher. p. 439. (ap. Galland. t. 3. p. 545 a.) .... In veteribus exemplaribus, id est, Hebræis et Græcis voluminibus, non tantum lunæ cursum, sed etiam solis non solum gressus, sed et singula ac minutissima horarum momenta ... invenimus computata. E quibus Hippolytus 16. annorum circulum quibusdam ignotis lunæ cursibus composuit. Alii 25., alii 30., nonnulli 84. annorum circulum computantes, nunquam ad veram Pascha computandi rationem pervenerunt. Verum majores nostri, Hebræorum et Græcorum librorum peritissimi, Isidorum, et Hieronymum, et Clementem dico, licet dissimilia mensium principia pro diversitate linguæ senserint; tamen ad unam eandemque Paschæ certissimam rationem, die et luna, et tempore convenientibus summa veneratione Dominicæ resurrectionis consenserunt. Sed et Origines, omnium eruditissimus, et calculi componendi perspicacissimus, ... Libellum de Pascha luculentissime edidit. In quo annuntians de die Paschæ non solum lunæ cursum, et æquinoctii transitum intuendum, sed et solis transcensum, omnium tenebrarum tetras insidias et offendicula auferentis, et lucis adventum, ac totius mundi elementorum virtutem et inspirationem afferentis, esse servandum, ita dicit: *In die,* inquit, *Paschæ non dico observandum, ut dies Dominica inveniatur, et lunæ 7.* [forte lunæ 14.] *dies transeundi, sed ut sol divisionem illam, lucis scilicet et tenebrarum, in exordio mundi, Domini dispensatione æqualiter compositam, transcendat, &c.*

[43] Answer to Cressy, [ch. 4. ss. 8–11.] p. 322. (v. 5. pp. 684, seqq.: especially p. 692, at end of s. 11.) After which time [A.D. 525] it did by degrees prevail in the Western parts, but was never fully received in France till it was settled there by the authority of Charles the Great.

[44] Connection of Hist. &c. part 2. b. 4. p. 237. (v. 3. p. 342.) However at length, about the year 800, the errors of the old way by that time growing very conspicuous, &c. [Connect. ibid. (v. 3. pp. 331, seqq.)

full account of the controversy between the Britons and Romans, which I shall not here repeat, but only acquaint the reader how these differences happened at first in the Church by using different ways of calculation.

It is agreed on all hands, that the first Christians of Jerusalem had no other way of finding out Easter, but by the Jewish cycle of eighty-four years, which the Jews had used some time before to settle the anniversary returns of their Passover: which cycle, though it was a little faulty, continued to be used by the Christians for near two hundred years. Not that they kept their Easter on the fourteenth day with the Jews, as Scaliger[44] and some others have erroneously hence concluded; for which they are corrected by Bishop Usher[45] and Bishop Beveridge[46], who show, that those first Christians of Jerusalem, though they followed the Jewish computation, did not keep Easter with the Jews on what day of the week soever it fell, but on the Sunday following in honour of our Saviour's resurrection. However, they continued to use the Jewish cycle, till the fifteen bishops of Jerusalem, who were of the circumcision, were succeeded by others who were not of the circumcision, and then they began to reckon their Easter by other computations. Epiphanius[47] says expressly, that they kept Easter at

In the first ages of the Church, &c. Ed.]

[44] De Emendatione Temporum, l. 2. (p. 150 b. 4.) In primordiis ecclesiæ tum Apostoli, tum qui eos centum annis postea secuti sunt, Pascha semper Judaice celebrarunt, ut testantur Eusebius et Historia vetus Ecclesiastica, et post omnes Nicephorus Callistus.—Ibid. (d. 7.) Quia per omnia Apostolos hac in re imitarentur, et permulti ex illis ex Judaismo ad Christianismum transissent, non obscurum est, eorum cyclum merum Judaicum fuisse, et de periodo Alexandrea Judæorum peti solitum.

[45] Prolegom. ad Ignat. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 204.) Ut maximopere viri docti decepti hic fuerint, qui ex consensu in Paschatis mensis ψηφισμῷ cum primis Hierosolymorum episcopis stabilito, Paschatis quocunque septimanæ die cum Quartadecimanis observandi ritum simul fuisse introductum sibi persuaserunt.

[46] Ad Can. Apost. 7. (ap. Cotel. v. 1. p. 460. ap. Bevereg. t. 2. append. p. 19.) Josephus Scaliger, tum Apostolos, tum qui eos centum annis postea secuti sunt, Pascha semper Judaice celebrasse ex Eusebio, Historia veteri Ecclesiastica, et Nicephoro Callisto affirmare non veretur, de Emendat. Temp. l. 2. p. 150. (Edit. Genev. 1629.) Verum hanc Scaligeri doctrinam auctoribus istis falso ascriptam et ab omnibus detestandam esse Dionysius Petavius fuse probat, de Doctrina Temp. l. 2. c. 57.

[47] Hær. 70. Audian. n. 10. (t. 1. p. 822 b.) Ὁρίζουσι γὰρ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ διατάξει οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, Ὅτι ὑμεῖς μὴ ψηφίζετε, ἀλλὰ ποιεῖτε, ὅταν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ὑμῶν, οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, μετ' αὐτῶν ἅμα ποιεῖτε.

first by the old Jewish cycle, and he quotes an order out of the Apostolical Constitutions (different from those which we have now) appointing them not to trouble themselves about calculations, but to keep the feast at the same time with the brethren that came out of the circumcision, and not be concerned though they were mistaken in their calculations. But when that succession of Jewish bishops was ended, with the destruction of Jerusalem in the time of Hadrian, some Christians began to inquire into the defects of the Jewish cycle, which was found to make Easter sometimes anticipate the vernal equinox, and so bring two Easters into one year. To remedy which inconvenience, they began to invent other cycles.

About the year 220, Hippolytus, bishop of Portus or Adana in Arabia, published a new cycle in his Paschal Canon, which, Eusebius[47] says, was called the Ἑκκαιδεκαετηρὶς, or *Cycle of sixteen years.* Not long after this, Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, about the year 250, set forth another Canon, called the Ὀκταετηρὶς, *or Cycle of eight years,* in which, as Eusebius[48] tells us, he particularly remarked, that the Paschal festival ought never to be kept till after the vernal equinox. Not long after, Anatolius, who was also an Alexandrian, about the year 270, published another cycle, which Eusebius[49] says was called the Ἐννεαδεκαετηρὶς, *the Cycle of nineteen:* in which he showed from several ancient Jewish writers themselves, that the Pasch ought never to be before the vernal equinox, and therefore there was a necessity of correcting their cycle. Hence about this time Bp. Usher[50] reckons that the seventh of those called the Apostolical Canons and the interpolation of

[47] L. 6. c. 22. (v. 1. p. 286. 20.) Τότε δῆτα καὶ Ἱππόλυτος συντάττων, μετὰ πλείστων ἄλλων ὑπομνημάτων, καὶ τὸ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα πεποίηται σύγγραμμα· ἐν ᾧ τῶν χρόνον ἀναγραφὴν ἐκθέμενος· καί τινα κανόνα ἑκκαιδεκαετηρίδος περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα προθεὶς, ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος αὐτοκράτορος Ἀλεξάνδρου τοὺς χρόνους περιγράφει.

[48] Ibid. l. 7. c. 20. (p. 344. 16.) ....Ἐν ᾗ [ἐπιστολῇ] καὶ κανόνα ἐκτίθεται ὀκταετηρίδος, ὅτι μὴ ἄλλοτε ἢ μετὰ τὴν ἐαρινὴν ἰσημερίαν προσήκοι τὴν τοῦ Πάσχα ἑορτὴν ἐπιτελεῖν παριστάμενος.

[49] Ibid. c. 32. (p. 369. 5.) Ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα Ἀνατολίου κανόνων· ἔχεις τοίνυν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τὴν νουμηνίαν τοῦ πρώτου μηνὸς, ἥτις ἁπάσης ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐννεακαιδεκαετηρίδος.

[50] Prolegom. in Ignat. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 204.) Atque hinc nata est, tum octavi [al. septimi] Canonis Apostolici prima constitutio, tum Διατάξεως Apostolicæ longe post ab interpolatore hoc nostro ad eundem facta conformatio.—See before, s. 3. n. 23, preceding.

the old Constitutions took their original. The former of which says[51], 'If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon, keep the Paschal feast before the vernal equinox, with the Jews, let him be deposed.' And the other[52], 'Ye brethren, who are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, ought to keep the Pasch with all diligence and exactness after the equinox, that ye may not twice in one *year* commemorate the passion of him, who died but once, and be careful that ye observe not the Pasch with the Jews. For we have now no communion with them. For they are deceived in their very calculation, which they imagine to be exact. So that they err in all respects, and are found to deviate from the truth.'

We see, at this time, the Jewish calculation was rejected by the Eastern Church, and yet no certain one agreed upon in its room, to fix unalterably the precise Lord's-day on which they were to celebrate this festival. Therefore this matter remaining still uncertain, the Council of Nice, which determined that it should be kept only upon the Lord's-day[53], is said also to have committed the care of the cycle to the bishops of Alexandria, that they might inform the rest of the world on what Lord's-day every year it was to be observed. Some think upon this Eusebius was employed to draw up the cycle of nineteen, which was afterwards perfected by Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, in the time of Theodosius, into a calculation for an hundred years. And yet after this it was that Cyril still complained of great confusion in the account of Easter in the Church, in the camp, and in the palace; and that the Roman and Alexandrian accounts sometimes varied a week or a month from each other, as we have seen before, which was owing purely to their different ways of calculation: because the Roman Church still proceeded by the old Jewish cycle of eighty-four, and not by the new Alexandrian cycle of nineteen.

[51] Apost 7. [al. 8.] See before, s. 3. n. 23, preceding.

[52] Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 17. [al. 16.] See before, b. 17. ch. 5. s. 22. p. 75. n. 55.

[53] Leonis, Ep. 63. ad Marcian. Imperat. (CC. t. 3. p. 1355 b.) Studuerunt itaque sancti patres [Nicæni] occasionem hujus erroris auferre, omnem hanc curam Alexandrino episcopo delegantes: quoniam apud Ægyptios hujus supputationis antiquitus tradita esse videbatur peritia, per quam, qui annis singulis dies prædictæ solemnitatis eveniret, Sedi Apostolicæ indicaretur, ut hujus scripti ad longinquiores ecclesias judicium generaliter percurreret.

To remedy this confusion, one Victorius, a Frenchman, was employed by Hilarius, archdeacon of Rome, to make a new Paschal Canon: but neither did his attempt succeed: for though he took in the Alexandrian cycle of nineteen, yet still he retained so much of the Roman, as made the variation of Easter Sunday sometimes a week, and sometimes a month between them. And no effectual cure was found for this, till Dionysius Exiguus, anno 525, brought the Alexandrian Canon entire into the use of the Roman Church. Meanwhile the Churches of France and Britain kept to the old Roman Canon, and it was two or three ages after before the new Roman, that is, the Alexandrian Canon, was, not without some struggle and difficulty, entirely settled among them.

This is the short of the history of the long dispute that happened in the Church among those that were otherwise agreed to keep Easter only on the Lord's-day, which was owing purely, as we have seen, to the great variety of their cycles and calculations. Meanwhile particular members of particular Churches had no concern in this dispute, but were obliged for peace sake to follow the rule of their own Church, though there might be some error in her calculation. For, as Chrysostom[54] says well upon the dispute with the Protopaschites, 'men were not bound to be over critical about days and times, and years, but carefully in such matters to follow the Church, and prefer peace and charity before all other things. For though the Church were in an error, yet there was no such advantage or commendation to be gained by the exact knowledge of times, as there might be disadvantage and dispraise arising from division and schism about it.' And with this consideration men were generally inclined to keep Easter in peace, and sometimes comply with what they thought a wrong calculation, rather than make a disturbance in the Church upon it. As Pope Leo tells the French and Spanish bishops, he complied with the Alexandrian cycle in the year 455, when there was a week's difference in their computation; the Roman cycle placing Easter on the

[54] Hom. 52. t. 5. p. 714. [Ed. Bened. Cont. Judæos, Hom. 3.] (t. 1. p. 615 a.) *Μὴ τοίνυν .... μηδὲ ἡμέρας, καὶ καιροὺς, καὶ ἐνιαυτοὺς παρατηρῶμεν, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μετ' ἀκριβείας ἑπώμεθα, τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην προτιμῶντες ἁπάντων· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐσφάλλετο ἡ ἐκκλησία, οὐ τοσοῦτον κατόρθωμα ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν χρόνων ἀκριβείας ἦν, ὅσον ἔγκλημα ἀπὸ τῆς διαιρέσεως καὶ τοῦ σχίσματος τούτου.*

seventeenth of April, and the Alexandrian on the twenty-fourth. But he acquiesced, he says[55], in their determination for the sake of peace and unity, and desired the western bishops so to do likewise, and to give notice of the time to their brethren; that they, who were united in the same faith, might not be divided about the solemnity of the festival. This was an excellent rule of peace, though there were some fierce and untractable spirits that would not always be content to be governed by it.

But they all agreed to pay a great respect and honour to it, as to the day of our Lord's resurrection.

5. Having thus far accounted for the differences that were in the Church about the time of this festival, I come now to show wherein they all agreed to pay a peculiar respect and honour to it. Gregory Nazianzen[56], after his manner, styles it the queen of days, and the festival of festivals, which excels all others, not only human, but even those that are instituted to the honour of Christ, as far as the sun goes beyond the other stars. It was a day of extraordinary rejoicing upon the account of our Lord's resurrection; being, as Chrysostom[57] styles it, 'the desirable festival of our salvation, the day of our Lord's resurrection, the foundation of our peace, the occasion of our reconciliation, the end of our contentions and enmity with God, the destruction of death, and our victory over the Devil.' Hence in some ancient writers it is distinguished from all other Lord's-days in the year by the peculiar name of *Dominica Gaudii, the Lord's-day of Joy*, as Papebrochius[58]

[55] Ep. 95. (CC. t. 3. p. 1420 a.).. Quia ergo studio unitatis et pacis malui Orientalium definitioni acquiescere, quam in tantæ festivitatis observantia dissidere: noverit fraternitas vestra, die octava Kalendarum Maiarum [al. 8. Calendas Maias] ab omnibus resurrectionem Dominicam celebrandam, et hoc ipsum per vos aliis esse fratribus intimandum, ut divinæ pacis consortio, sicut una fide jungimur, ita una solemnitate feriemur.—Vid. Prosper. Chronic. an. 455. (Oper. Paris. 1611. p. 754.) Eodem anno Pascha Dominicum die 8. Kalendas Maii celebratum est, &c.

[56] Orat. 19. in Funere Patris, (t. 1. p. 304 a.).... Τὸ ἅγιον Πάσχα καὶ περιβόητον, ἡ βασίλισσα τῶν ἡμερῶν ἡμέρα.—Orat. 42. de Pasch. (ibid. p. 676 c.) Αὕτη ἑορτῶν ἡμῖν ἑορτὴ, καὶ πανήγυρις πανηγύρεων, τοσοῦτον ὑπεραίρουσα πάσας, οὐ τὰς ἀνθρωπικὰς μόνον καὶ χαμαὶ ἐρχομένας, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τὰς αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τελουμένας, ὅσον ἀστέρας ἥλιος.

[57] Hom. 85. de Pasch. (t. 3. p. 750 a.) Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡμῖν παραγέγονεν ἡ ποθεινὴ καὶ σωτήριος ἑορτὴ, ἡ ἀναστάσιμος ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ τῆς εἰρήνης ὑπόθεσις, ἡ τῆς καταλλαγῆς ἀφορμὴ, ἡ τῶν πολέμων ἀναίρεσις, ἡ τοῦ θανάτου κατάλυσις, ἡ τοῦ Διαβόλου ἧττα.

[58] Vita Pachomii, 14. Maii. (Ed. Venet. t. 3. p. 333. ap. cap. 12. a. 12.) .... In die Dominica Gaudii inter psallentium fratrum voces mortuum

and Pagi[59] have observed upon the Life of Pachomius and Theodore, the latter of which saints is said to have ended his life *Dominica Gaudii*, which those learned men think can be understood of no other but Easter Sunday; and that implies that this was then a known and noted appellation.

On this day the emperors granted a general release to the prisons and pardoned all criminals, except some few that were guilty of crimes of a more unpardonable nature.

6. One great instance of this public joy was given by the emperors, who were used to grant a general release to the prisons on this day, and by an act of grace, called *their indulgence*, set all criminals free, except some few that had committed crimes of a more unpardonable nature.

This custom was first begun by Valentinian, anno 367, who has two laws in the Theodosian Code to this purpose. The former of which[60] runs in these terms: 'In honour of the Paschal festival, which we celebrate from the bottom of our heart, we open the prisons to all criminals that lie bound in chains, only excepting such as are guilty of sacrilege, treason, robbing of graves, poisoning, magic, adultery, stealing or ravishing of virgins, and murder, from the benefit of this indulgence.'

Valentinian Junior and Theodosius, anno 381, made a like act of grace[61], only excepting the same crimes, under which they more especially comprised parricide, incest, and counterfeiting the public coin, as species of murder, adultery and treason, which for their infamous character ought to have a

terræ mandavit.—[Conf. Papebroch. in loc. (ibid. p. 334. n. e.) *Dominica Gaudii* dicitur ipsa Dominica Paschæ; toti ecclesiæ lætissima et totius anni festivissima, etiam apud monachos, &c. Ed.]

[59] Critic. in Baron. an. 370. n. 4. [al. 5.] (t. 1. p. 520.) Scripta ea epistola [Athanasii de S. Theodori morte] ut notat Papebrochius in Vita SS. Pachomii et Theodori, abbatum Tabennensium in Thebaide, die 14. Maii, paragrapho 17. anno Christi 368, post Theodori mortem, quæ, ut legitur in laudata Vita, contigit *Dominica Gaudii*, id est, *Paschatis*, ut Papebrochius interpretatur.

[60] Cod. Theod. lib. 9. tit. 38. de Indulgentiis Criminum, leg. 3. (t. 3. p. 271.) Ob diem Paschæ, quem intimo corde celebramus, omnibus quos reatus astringit, carcer inclusit, claustra dissolvimus; attamen sacrilegus, in majestate reus, in mortuo, veneficus, sive maleficus, adulter, raptor, homicida, communione istius muneris separentur.—Vid. leg. 4. ejusd. imperat. (ibid. p. 273.) Paschæ celebritas postulat, ut quoscunque nunc ægra exspectatio quæstionis, pœnæque formido solicitat, absolvamus. Decretis tamen Veterum mos gerendus est, ne temere homicidii crimen, adulterii fœditatem, majestatis injuriam, maleficiorum scelus, insidias venenorum, raptusque violentiam sinamus evadere.

[61] Ibid. legg. 6. et 7. See b. 16. ch. 10. s. 1. v. 6. p. 387. n. 43.

more notorious mark set upon them. They also excepted such as relapsed into their former crimes, because they abused the indulgence of the prince, by making that an incitement to sin, which was intended only as a means to correct evil habits, and bring them to a reformation. The same emperor, anno 385, made another decree[62], 'that whereas it might happen, that by the negligence or remissness of messengers, or any other accident, their letters of grace might come too late, the judges of provinces should be empowered, as soon as Easter day was come, to dispense the accustomed indulgence, causing the prisons to be opened, the chains to be knocked off, and the persons to be set at liberty; such only excepted as it would be a scandal to pardon, because their actions were a reproach to the purity of that holy and joyful season, 'For who,' say they with great elegancy, 'would grant an indulgence to a sacrilegious villain at an holy season? Who would pardon an adulterer, or an incestuous person, at a time which calls for perfect chastity? Who would not pursue a ravisher of virgins in the profoundest peace and public joy? Let him have no rest nor respite from his bonds, whose barbarous cruelty would not suffer the dead to rest quietly in their graves. Let the poisoner, and the sorcerer, and the falsifier of the coin still suffer torment. Let the murderer expect the same that he has done to others: and the rebel despair of pardon from his prince, against whom he has plotted treason.' But excepting these criminals, all others had the benefit of these imperial indulgences at this holy season. Justinian takes no notice of the former laws, but inserts this last into his Code[63], which

[62] Ibid. leg. 8. (t. 3. p. 277.) Nemo deinceps, tardiores fortassis, affatus nostræ perennitatis exspectet: exsequantur judices, quod indulgere consuevimus. Ubi primum dies Paschalis exstiterit, nullum teneat carcer inclusum, omnium vincula solvantur. Sed ab his secernimus eos, quibus contaminari potius gaudia lætitiamque communem, si dimittantur, advertimus. Quis enim sacrilego diebus sanctis indulgeat? Quis adultero vel incesti reo tempore castitatis ignoscat? Quis non raptorem in summa quiete et gaudio communi persequatur instantius? Nullam accipiat requiem vinculorum, qui quiescere sepultos quadam sceleris immanitate non sivit: patiatur tormenta veneficus, maleficus, adulteratorque monetæ: homicida, quod fecit, semper exspectet: reus etiam majestatis de Domino, adversum quem talia molitus est, veniam sperare non debet.

[63] L. 1. tit. 4. de Episcopal. Audientia, leg. 3. (t. 4. p. 147.) [Ubi primus dies Paschalis exstiterit, nullum teneat carcer inclusum ... Sed ab his secernimus eos, a quibus contaminari potius gaudia, lætitiamque communem, si dimittantur, animad-

shows that it became the standing law of the Roman empire. And the Goths adopted it also into their law, as appears from one of Cassiodore's Epistles[64], which Gothofred commends as written with a great deal of elegancy upon this subject.

The ancient Fathers not only mentioned these Paschal indulgences, but frequently speak of them with great commendations. St. Chrysostom[65] more than once tells us, that when Flavian, bishop of Antioch, went to intercede with Theodosius the Emperor for that city, which by the seditious practices of some had highly incurred his displeasure, among other arguments to mitigate his anger against them, he made use of this, taken from his own practice, 'that in honour of the Paschal festival he was used to send letters round the world, to cause all prisons to be opened, and all that were in bonds to be set at liberty. 'Therefore take an example,' said he, 'from yourself, and call to mind your own humanity; when in one of your letters, as if it had not been enough to discharge the prisoners, you were pleased to add, I wish I were able to recall those that are already executed, and restore them to life again.' St. Ambrose[66] made use of the same argument to aggravate the

vertimus. Quis enim sacrilego diebus sanctis indulgeat? Quis adultero, &c.

[64] Variar. lib. 11. Ep. ult. (t. 1. p. 174.) Ad te claustrorum magistrum verba revocemus, &c. Ut tuos quoque gemitus consolemur, illos tibi tantummodo vindica, quos lex pietatis gratia non relaxat, ne, cum truculentis parceret, asperrima facinora levigaret.

[65] Hom. 6. ad Pop. Antioch. p. 95. (t. 2. p. 76 c.) Ἐν ταύταις γοῦν ταῖς ἡμέραις πέμψας [nempe, ὁ βασιλεὺς] ἐπιστολὴν εἰς τιμὴν τῆς ἑορτῆς, τοὺς τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντας σχεδὸν ἀφῆκεν ἅπαντας, καὶ ταύτην ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἡμέτερος εἰσελθὼν ἀναγνώσεται τὴν ἐπιστολὴν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ τῶν οἰκείων αὐτὸν ἀναμνήσει νόμων, καὶ ἐρεῖ πρὸς αὐτόν, Ὅτι σὺ σαυτὸν παρακάλεσον, καὶ τὰ σαυτοῦ μίμησαι [μέμνησο. Ben. et Sav.], οἴκοθεν ἔχεις τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς φιλανθρωπίας, δίκαιον οὐχ εἷλου ποιήσαι φόνον, καὶ ἄδικον ὑπομενεῖς ἐργάσασθαι; τοὺς ἐληλεγμένους καὶ καταδικασθέντας τὴν ἑορτὴν αἰδεσθεὶς ἀφῆκας, καὶ τοὺς ἀνευθύνους καὶ μηδὲν τετολμηκότας κατακρινεῖς, εἰπέ μοι, καὶ ταῦτα τῆς ἑορτῆς παρούσης; μηδαμῶς, βασιλεῦ. Σὺ, διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ταύτης διαλεγόμενος, ταῖς πόλεσι πάσαις ἔλεγες, Εἴθε μοι δυνατὸν ἦν καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀναστῆσαι. Ταύτης δεόμεθα τῆς φιλανθρωπίας, τούτων δεόμεθα τῶν ῥημάτων νῦν.—Hom. 20. ibid. p. 256. [Bened. Hom. 21.] (ibid. p. 219 d.) Μέμνησαι πρώην, ὅτε τῆς ἑορτῆς ταύτης καταλαβούσης ἐπιστολὴν ἔπεμψας πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης, κελεύουσαν τοὺς τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντας ἀφεῖναι, καὶ συγχωρεῖν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἐγκλήματα· καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἀρκούντων ἐκείνων δεῖξαί σου τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν, ἔλεγες διὰ τῶν γραμμάτων, Ὅτι εἴθέ μοι δυνατὸν ἦν, καὶ τοὺς ἀπελθόντας καλέσαι καὶ ἀναστῆσαι καὶ πρὸς τὴν προτέραν ἀναγαγεῖν ζωήν.

[66] Ep. 33. [al. 20.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 853 d. n. 6.) Itaque sanctis diebus hebdomadis ultimæ, quibus solebant debitorum laxari vincula, &c.

offence of the younger Valentinian, when by the persuasion of his mother Justina, the Arian empress, he had sent some of the Catholic bishops to prison at the holy feast of Easter, when it was customary to loose the bonds of those that were already in prison, and which he himself before was used to do, as appears from his laws already mentioned. The same custom is mentioned by Gregory Nyssen[67], who speaking of the resurrection of Christ, says, 'There is no one so miserable as not to find a release by the magnificence of this great festival; for at this time the prisoner is loosed, the debtor is set at liberty, and the slave has his manumission or freedom granted him by the kind declaration of the Church.' In like manner, the petition presented by the Eutychian monks to the second Council of Ephesus, recorded in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon[68], takes notice, 'that as the Church was wont to absolve sinners at Easter from the bonds of excommunication, so the emperors used to loose the bonds of those that were in prison for their offences.'

Chrysostom[69] further acquaints us with the reason or ground of this practice, telling us, 'that the emperors set prisoners at liberty, that they might imitate, as far as in them lay, the example of their Lord and Master. For as he delivered us from the grievous prison of our sins, and made us capable of enjoying innumerable blessings; so ought we in like manner, as far as was possible, to imitate the mercy and kindness of our Lord.' So again in his Homily upon the 145th Psalm[70],

[67] Hom. 3. de Resurrect. Christ. (t. 3. p. 420 a.) *Οὐδεὶς δὲ οὕτως κατώδυνος, ὡς ἄνεσιν μὴ εὑρέσθαι· τῇ μεγαλοπρεπείᾳ τῆς ἑορτῆς νῦν ὁ δεσμώτης λύεται, ὁ χρεωστὴς ἀφίεται, ὁ δοῦλος ἐλευθεροῦται τῷ ἀγαθῷ καὶ φιλανθρώπῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κηρύγματι.*

[68] Act. 1. (t. 4. p. 278 c.) *Ἐπέστη καὶ ἡ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους ἡμέρα, καὶ νὺξ ἱερὰ, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἑορτὴ, καθ' ἣν λύεται μὲν τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν ἐπιτίμια· λύεται δὲ παρὰ τῶν βασιλευόντων ἐπὶ τῶν ἐγκλημάτων τὰ δεσμὰ τοῖς ὑπευθύνοις.*

[69] Hom. 30. in Gen. t. 2. p. 427. (t. 4. p. 294 d.) *Τοὺς τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντας ἀφιᾶσι τῶν δεσμῶν, καὶ κατὰ δύναμιν ἀνθρωπίνην μιμοῦνται τὸν ἑαυτῶν Δεσπότην· καθάπερ γὰρ αὐτός, φησι, τοῦ χαλεποῦ δεσμωτηρίου τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἡμᾶς ἀνίησι, καὶ τῶν μυρίων ἀγαθῶν παρέχει τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον καὶ ἡμᾶς, φησι, προσήκει, οἷς δυνάμεθα μιμητὰς γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ Δεσπότου φιλανθρωπίας.*

[70] Hom. in Ps. 145. t. 3. p. 823. (t. 5. p. 526 c.) *Βασιλικὰ καταπέμπονται γράμματα λέγοντα, Τοὺς τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντας ἀφίεσθαι τῶν δεσμῶν· καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ Δεσπότης ἡμῶν, ἐν ᾅδου γενόμενος, τοὺς κατεχομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου πάντας ἀπέλυσεν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ δοῦλοι, τὰ κατὰ δύναμιν εἰσφέροντες, καὶ τὴν δεσποτικὴν μιμούμενοι φιλανθρωπίαν,*

which was spoken in the Passion-week, and therefore goes under both titles [71]: 'The imperial letters,' says he, 'are sent forth commanding all prisoners to be loosed from their bonds. For as our Lord, when he was ἐν Ἅιδου, (*in hell*, or *the state and place of the dead*,) set at liberty all that were under the power of death; so his servants, contributing what they are able, in imitation of the mercy of their Lord, loose men from these visible bonds, having no power to loose them from those which are spiritual and invisible.' Whence we may observe, that these indulgences of the princes were not designed to make men believe they were cleared either of the guilt or infamy of their crimes, but only freed from the punishment that was due to them. Both the guilt and scandal still remained upon them, and the very indulgence itself was a note of infamy, implying that they had done something that needed such a pardon. And for this reason these indulgences were never granted promiscuously to whole bodies of men, because that would have been to have set a mark of infamy and condemnation upon the innocent as well as the guilty, as Valentinian [72] once told the senate, when they petitioned for a general act of grace to be granted to their whole body for the sake of a few offenders in it. He assured them he was ready to pardon any particular members among them; but to grant a general indulgence to the senate, was to defame the senate without reason: since every indulgence set a mark upon those whom it freed; and did not erase the infamy of the crime, but only relax the punishment. For, as one of the old poets[73] said well,

Pœna potest demi, culpa perennis erit.

The punishment may be remitted, but the crime, both in its guilt and scandal, will remain upon men for ever, notwithstanding any such human acts of grace, unless they take some proper methods to sue out a divine pardon. However the

δεσμῶν ἀπολύουσι τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ἐπειδὴ τῶν νοητῶν οὐκ ἰσχύουσι.

[71] Hom. 78. In Hebdomadam Magnam, juxt. Ed. Savil. Eton. 1613. t. 5. p. 541. 37.

[72] Cod. Theod. l. 9. tit. 38. ut supra, leg. 5. (t. 3. p. 274.) Indulgentia, Patres Conscripti, quos liberat, notat; nec infamiam criminis tollit, sed pœnæ gratiam facit. In uno hoc, aut in duobus reis ratum sit; qui indulgentiam senatui dat, damnat senatum.

[73] [Ovid. ex Ponto, l. 1. Ep. 1. v. 64. Ed.]

emperors were willing to grant what indulgence they could to men's bodies at this holy festival, that criminals might partake of their clemency shown in imitation of their Lord, and use the opportunity to do something more for themselves, by having recourse to heaven as penitents, and applying to the throne of grace for a more effectual pardon.

At this time also it was usual more than ordinarily for men to show their charity to slaves by granting them their freedom.

7. We may observe further out of the forementioned place of Gregory Nyssen[74], that it was usual at this time not only to release criminals out of prison by a public act of the State, but for private men also to show their charity to their fellow creatures, by granting slaves their manumission or freedom, as a proper expression of mercy becoming this holy festival, which brought a general redemption from slavery, and universal liberty to mankind by our Saviour's resurrection. And that there might be no clog or impediment to this good disposition cast in men's way to hinder this kind of charity, the law provided, that though all other kinds of legal processes should cease for the whole week following this festival, yet whatever was necessary to be done by way of charity for the manumission of slaves, should be allowed of, as comporting with the true intent and design of this holy solemnity. This we learn from a law of Theodosius, in the Justinian Code[75], which says, 'Let all actions at law, whether public or private, cease in the fifteen Paschal days,' that is, in the week before and the week after Easter Sunday: 'yet all men have liberty at this time to grant freedom to their slaves, and whatever acts are necessary to be done in law, to promote this end, are not prohibited.' This is the same exception that Constantine had made before with respect to the Lord's-day[76], on which all proceedings at law were prohibited, except such as were matters of absolute necessity or great charity, among which he reckons the manumission of slaves, which therefore was allowed at any time, as has been shown before in speaking of the Lord's-day [in the second section of the second chapter of this Book].

And to the poor by li-

8. But this was not the only instance of their charity at this

[74] See n. 67, preceding.

[75] Cod. Justin. l. 3. tit. 12. de Feriis, leg. 8. (t. 4. p. 608.) Actus omnes, seu publici sunt seu privati, diebus quindecim Paschalibus conquiescant. In his tamen et emancipandi et manumittendi cuncti licentiam habeant; et super his acta non prohibeantur.

[76] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 3. de Feriis, leg. 1. See ch. 2. s. 2. p. 237. n. 58.

beral donations.

holy season. For they were ambitious at this time especially to show their liberality to the poor; nothing being thought more congruous and suitable to the occasion, than for men to make the hearts of the poor rejoice, at a time when they remembered the common fountain of their mercies, as Commodian[77] words it in his Instructions. Upon this account Eusebius[78] tells us Constantine was used, as soon as the morning of Easter-day appeared, to open his hand in liberality to all nations, provinces, and people; bestowing rich gifts upon them, in imitation of the beneficence of the common Saviour of mankind.

The whole week after Easter-day celebrated with sermons, communions, &c, as part of the same festival.

9. Neither did they confine their acts of piety and devotion to Easter-day, but kept the whole week following in the strictest manner, as part of the same festival; holding religious assemblies every day not only for prayer, but for preaching and receiving the communion also. This is evident in part from what has been observed in the beginning of the first section of this chapter, that the Paschal solemnity in its full extent including fifteen days, or two whole weeks, the one before, and the other after Easter-day.

Concerning that which followed after, (and of that we are only speaking here,) Chrysostom[79] says plainly, that they had sermons every day throughout the whole week. For seven days together we hold religious assemblies, and prepare a spiritual table for you, making you partakers of the divine oracles, and every day anointing you, (he means with the spiritual unction of instruction,) and arming you against the Devil. A little after he says again, 'Seven days together ye have preaching, that ye may learn perfectly to wrestle with your enemy;' and he calls the whole solemnity 'a spiritual marriage,'

[77] Instruct. c. 75. (ap. Galland. t. 3. p. 649 b.)
Congruit in Pascha, die felicissimo nostro;
Lætentur et illi, qui postulant sumpta divina:
Erogetur eis, quod sufficit, vinum et esca.

[78] Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 22. (v. 1. p. 637. 17.) *Διαλαβούσης δὲ τῆς ἕω, τὰς σωτηρίους εὐεργεσίας μιμούμενος, πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν λαοῖς τε καὶ δήμοις τὴν εὐεργετικὴν ἐξήπλου δεξιὰν, πλούσια πάντα τοῖς πᾶσι δωρούμενος.*

[79] Hom. 34. de Resurrect. Christ. t. 5. pp. 531 et 532. [Bened. Cont. Ebrios. et de Resurrect.] (t. 2. p. 445 b, d.) *Διὰ τοῦτο ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς σύναξιν ἐπιτελοῦμεν, τὴν πνευματικὴν ὑμῖν παρατιθέμενοι τράπεζαν· ποιοῦντες ὑμᾶς ἀπολαύειν θείων λογίων. . . . . Διὰ τοῦτο ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς ἀπολαύετε διδασκαλίας, ὥστε ἀκριβῶς μαθεῖν τὰ παλαίσματα.*

which, after the manner of other marriage-solemnities, lasted seven days. Upon this account the author of the Constitutions[80] requires servants to rest from their labour this whole week, that they might attend sermons and other offices of divine service. The same is required in the second Council of Mascon[81]: 'On those six most holy days let no one presume to do any servile labour, but let all with one consent attend the service of the Paschal festival, and persevere in offering up their daily sacrifices, praising him who created and redeemed us both evening and morning and at noon-day.' And to the same purpose the Council of Trullo[82]: 'From the holy day of the resurrection of Christ our God *to new Sunday,—μέχρι τῆς καινῆς Κυριακῆς,*—all the faithful ought to spend their time at church, and exercise themselves incessantly the whole week in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, rejoicing in Christ, and celebrating the festival by attendance on the reading of the holy mysteries. For so we shall rise with Christ, and be exalted with him. Therefore let neither horse-racing, nor any other public games or shows, be performed on these days.'

All public games prohibited during this whole season.

10. What this Council here forbids under the name of *public games*, is agreeable to former imperial laws, which prohibited them not only on Easter-day, as being one of the Lord's-days, but extended the prohibition to the whole week after. For so Theodosius Junior[83] had expressly determined, 'that at Easter and Pentecost all public games and pleasures, both of the theatre and circus, should universally be denied to the people during the whole time that the newly-baptized wore their white and shining garments, representing the light of their

[80] L. 8. c. 33. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 414.) *Τὴν μεγάλην ἑβδομάδα πᾶσαν, καὶ τὴν μετ' αὐτὴν ἀργεῖτωσαν οἱ δοῦλοι, ὅτι ἡ μὲν πάθους ἐστὶν, ἡ δὲ ἀναστάσεως· καὶ χρεία διδασκαλίας, τίς ὁ παθὼν καὶ ἀναστὰς, ἢ τίς ὁ συγχωρήσας, ἢ καὶ ἀναστήσας.*

[81] C. 2. (t. 5. p. 981 d.) Ut sanctissimis illis sex diebus nemo servile opus audeat facere, sed omnes simul coadunati, hymnis Paschalibus indulgentes, perseverationis nostræ præsentiam quotidianis sacrificiis ostendamus, laudantes Creatorem ac Regeneratorem nostrum vespere et mane et meridie.

[82] C. 66. (t. 6. p. 1171 e.) *Ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας ἀναστασίμου Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας μέχρι τῆς καινῆς Κυριακῆς, τὴν ὅλην ἑβδομάδα ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις ἐκκλησίαις σχολάζειν δεῖ ἀπαραλείπτως τοὺς πιστοὺς, ἐν ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς εὐφραινομένους ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ ἑορτάζοντας, καὶ τῇ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει προσέχοντας, καὶ τῶν ἁγίων μυστηρίων κατατρυφῶντας· ἐσόμεθα γὰρ οὕτω Χριστῷ συνανιστάμενοί τε καὶ συνανυψούμενοι. Μηδαμῶς οὖν ἐν ταῖς προκειμέναις ἡμέραις ἱπποδρομία ἢ ἑτέρα δημώδης θέα ἐπιτελείσθω.*

[83] Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. See before, ch. 2. s. 4. p. 248. n. 88.

heavenly washing:' that is till the Sunday following, which, as we shall see by and by, was the conclusion of this festival: and the reason of this prohibition is there given: 'because during this season the minds of Christians ought wholly to be employed in the worship of God.' And the prohibition extends also to Jews and Gentiles, who are so far obliged to pay a respect to this holy time, as to know how to make a distinction between days of supplication and days of pleasure.

And all proceedings at law, excepting some special and extraordinary cases.

11. And for the same reason all proceedings at law were prohibited at this season, except in some special and extraordinary cases. As the case of manumission of slaves, which being a case of great charity, was allowed at all seasons; as has been noted before[84] out of Gregory Nyssen and a law of Theodosius, which allows and confirms all acts of law that were necessary to be done in order to set slaves at liberty and give them their freedom. And a like exception was made by Theodosius Junior and Honorius[85] in the case of trying pirates, because this was necessary to be done immediately for the sake of the public safety: and therefore the examination of such criminals was allowed in Lent, and on the Easter festival. But, excepting such cases of necessity and charity, all other actions at law were entirely superseded at this time in honour of the Paschal festival. There are laws of Theodosius in both the Codes[86] to this purpose, that the whole fifteen days of the Paschal solemnity, that is, the week before Easter-day, called *the Great Week* in Lent, and the week following, should be times of perfect vacation from all actions and business of the law; the forementioned cases only excepted. And they are often mentioned and referred to by St. Austin[87], Chrysostom[88],

[84] Ss. 6 and 7 of this chapter, nn. 67 and 75, preceding. See also before, ch. 2. s. 2. p. 236.

[85] Cod. Theod. l. 9. tit. 35. de Quæstionibus, leg. 7. (t. 3. p. 255.) Provinciarum judices moneantur, ut in Isaurorum latronum quæstionibus nullum Quadragesimæ, nec venerabilem Pascharum diem existiment excipiendum, ne differatur sceleratorum proditio consiliorum, &c.—Conf. ibid. l. 13. tit. 5. de Naviculariis, leg. 38. (t. 5. p. 90.) Hujusmodi igitur inquisitio etiam diebus feriatis et devotionum absque ulla observatione peragenda est.

[86] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 121.)... Sanctos quoque Paschæ dies, qui septeno vel præcedunt numero vel sequuntur, in eadem observatione numeramus.—Cod. Justin. de Feriis, legg. 2, 7, 8. (t. 4. pp. 605, 607, 608.)

[87] Serm. 19. ex 40. a Sirmondo editis. See n. 91, following.

[88] Hom. 30. in Gen. et in Ps. 145. See nn. 69 and 70, preceding.

and others, who need not here be repeated, because they have been alleged before upon other occasions in the first and sixth sections of this chapter.

12. Neither need I remark here, that Easter was the most noted and solemn time of baptism in the Church, because of this the reader has had a particular account before[89] in treating of baptism: but I only observe, that the Sunday after Easter, which was the conclusion of the Paschal feast, was usually observed with great solemnity. For on this day the *neophytes*, or *persons newly baptized*, were wont to lay aside their white garments, and commit them to the repository of the church. Whence, as it was sometimes called *the octaves of Easter*, as being the conclusion of the Paschal festival, so more commonly it was known by the name of *Dominica in albis, the Sunday of Albes*, or *white garments*. Under which denominations we meet with it several times in St. Austin in his Sermons upon this day: some of which[90] are said to be preached *Dominica in Octavis Paschæ;* and others[91] *Dominica in Albis*, if any stress is to be laid upon the titles, which perhaps may have been added by other writers about the time of Charles the Great, in whose days these were the common appellations among all the Ritualists[92] of the Latin Church.

The Sunday after Easter, commonly called *Dominica Nova*, and *Dominica in Albis*, observed with great solemnity as the conclusion of the Paschal festival.

But the Greek writers give it another name, viz. Καινὴ Κυριακὴ, or Διακαινήσιμος, *the New Sunday*. Under which title Nazianzen[93] and Chrysostom[94] have Sermons upon it, and the Council of Trullo[95] mentions it under the same denomination, saying, 'from the day of the Lord's resurrection to the new Lord's-day men shall attend at church to singing,

[89] See b. 11. ch. 6. s. 7. v. 4. p. 105.

[90] Serm. 160. de Tempore. [al. Serm. 376.] (t. 5. p. 1468 e.)—It. 162. [Corrige 157. al. Append. Serm. 172.] (t. 5. append. p. 296 c.)—It. 163. [al. Append. Serm. 168.] (ibid. p. 292 f.)—It. 164. [al. Serm. 224.] (t. 5. p. 968 a.) [In the Benedictine Edition the two last are entitled simply, *In die Paschæ*. Serm. 162, which is Serm. 171 of the Appendix, is entitled, *In Pascha* 13, *de Resurrectione Mortuorum*. Ed.]

[91] [Serm. 19. ex 40. a Sirmond. edit. [al. Serm. 259.] (t. 5. p. 1059.) In die Dominico octavarum Paschæ. This is the title of the Benedictine Editors. Ed.]

[92] Vid. Vicecom. de Ritibus Baptism. l. 5. c. 12. (pp. 733, seqq.) *De ritu vesti candidæ benedicendi, et de tempore, quo baptizati ipsam deferebant.*

[93] Orat. 43. In Dominicam Novam. (t. 1. p. 697 b.) The title.

[94] Hom. 106. In Dominicam Novam. Ed. Savil. t. 7. p. 575. (t. 12. p. 804.) Εἰς τὴν Καινὴν Κυριακὴν, κ. τ. λ.

[95] C. 66. See before, n. 82, preceding.

reading the Scriptures, and participating of the holy mysteries.' It was so called from the renovation of men by the new birth of baptism; being the close of the great festival of Easter, at which they were baptized, and born anew of water and the Holy Ghost, and then clothed in new and white garments, emblems of their new light and birth; which being laid aside again the Sunday following, the day was called *the new Lord's-day* from the whole action that went before it: as the six days of the week preceding it were called *dies neophytorum, the days of the neophytes,* or *the newly-baptized,* for the same reason; as we find in St. Austin[96], who, speaking of the time from Easter Sunday to the Sunday following inclusively, styles it *octo dies neophytorum, the eight days of the neophytes,* taking both Sundays into the number.

CHAP. VI.

Of Pentecost, or Whitsuntide.

Pentecost taken in a double sense among the Ancients. First, for the fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide; and, secondly, for the single day of Pentecost.

1. The next great festival was that of Pentecost, which is taken in a double sense among the Ancients. For sometimes it signifies the whole space of fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, which was one continued festival; and sometimes it was taken in a more restrained sense for that particular time which was set aside for the commemoration of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles. In the former acceptation Tertullian[1] speaks of it, when he tells the Christians, by way of triumph over the Heathens, 'that the Heathen festivals were but a single day in the return of every year: but the Christians had a festival every eighth day, (meaning the Lord's-day:) and besides that, they had one continued festival of fifty days, which was more than all the festivals the Heathen could pretend to reckon up in a whole year.' So again he says in another place[2], 'that Pentecost was a large space of

[96] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 17. (t. 2. p. 141 d.) Nam ut quadraginta illi dies ante Pascha observentur, ecclesiæ consuetudo roboravit, sic etiam ut octo dies neophytorum distinguantur a cæteris, id est, ut octavus primo concinat.

[1] De Idolol. c. 14. (p. 94 b.) Nam ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est: tibi octavus quisque dies [al. octavo quoque die.] Excerpe singulas solemnitates nationum, et in ordinem exsere [al. texe]; Pentecosten implere non poterunt.

[2] De Bapt. c. 19. (p. 232 b.) Exinde Pentecoste ordinandis lavacris latissimum spatium est, quo et Domini resurrectio inter discipulos fre-

time appointed by the Church for administering of baptism, during which season the resurrection of the Lord was frequently demonstrated to the disciples, and the grace of the Holy Ghost was first poured out upon them.' Where it is plain he takes Pentecost not barely for the day on which the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles, but for the whole time that our Saviour conversed amongst his disciples, to give them proof of his resurrection. Therefore, though Vicecomes [3] reprehends Ludovicus Vives for asserting this, yet Habertus [4] defends him out of these places of Tertullian; and Dr. Cave [5] and other learned men are of the same opinion. Particularly Gothofred takes a great deal of pains to prove this to be the meaning of *Quinquagesima,* which is the Latin name for *Pentecost,* in that famous law of Theodosius Junior [6], where he prohibits all public games and sports, during the solemnities of Easter and Pentecost, which solemnities are there described by these two circumstances or characters: first, that the neophytes then laid aside their white and bright garments [7], representing the new light and brightness of their holy and heavenly washing; and secondly, that at this season the Acts of the Apostles called the *Apostolical Passions,* were read in commemoration and confirmation of the great doctrine of Christianity, our Lord's resurrection.

2. The latter of these circumstances is a peculiar charac- During which time

quentita est, et gratia Spiritus Sancti dedicata, &c.—See Can. Apost. 37. [al. 38.] (Cotel. [c. 30.] v. 1. p. 442.) et c. 20. C. Antioch. (t. 2. p. 570 e.) where mention is made of the fourth week in Pentecost.

[3] De Rit. Bapt. l. 1. c. 25. (p. 152.) Neque assentior Ludovico Vivi, qui in grammaticæ ludo edoctus, S. Augustini libros de Civitate Dei exponere parum feliciter aggressus est. Is enim (Nota K. in c. 8. l. 22.) a Paschate ad Pentecosten baptismum quotidie administrari solitum, nullo auctore, affirmat.

[4] Archierat. part. 8. observ. 5. (p. 134.) Immerito Josephus Vicecomes, opere de Baptismi Ritibus, sugillat Ludovicum Vivem, quod dixerit, id moris fuisse, ut toto illo temporis decursu a Pascha ad Pentecosten baptizaretur: nullo, inquit, auctore. Sed nos auctorem illi subministramus, Tertullianum, Lib. de Baptismo, ad fin.; *Diem baptismo solemniorem, &c.*

[5] Primitive Christianity, part 1. ch. 10. p. 397. (p. 149.) When I say that these were the two fixed times of baptism, &c.

[6] Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. (t. 5. p. 353.) Paschæ etiam et Quinquagesimæ diebus, (quamdiu cælestis lumen lavacri, imitantia novam sancti baptismatis lucem, vastimenta testantur: quo tempore et commemoratio Apostolicæ Passionis, potius Christianitatis magistræ, a cunctis jure celebratur,) omni theatrorum atque circensium voluptate populis denegata, &c.

[7] See b. 12. ch. 4. s. 6. v. 4. p. 236. n. 49.

the Church chiefly exercised herself in reading and meditating upon the Acts of the Apostles, as the great confirmation of our Lord's resurrection.

teristic, not of any single day, but of the whole time between Easter and Whitsuntide, during which time it was customary in the Church to read the Acts of the Apostles, as we learn from several passages in Chrysostom, which plainly show that he takes Pentecost for the whole fifty days between Easter-day and Whitsunday. One of his Homilies [8] is chiefly spent in giving an answer to this question, Why the Acts of the Apostles are read in Pentecost? The sermon itself bears this title; and in answer to the question he says, 'that on every festival such portions of Scripture were read as particularly related to that festival. Thus on the day of our Saviour's passion all such Scriptures were read as had any relation to the cross; on the Great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, they read all such portions of Scripture as contained the history of his being betrayed, crucified, dead, and buried; on Easter-day they read such passages as gave an account of his resurrection.' But then it seemed a difficulty why the Acts of the Apostles, which contain the history of their miracles done after Pentecost, should be read in this interval, before Pentecost was fully ended. To this he answers, 'that the miracles of the Apostles contained in that book were the great demonstration of our Saviour's resurrection: and therefore the Church appointed that book to be read always immediately after our Saviour's resurrection, to give men the evidences and proofs of that holy mystery, which was the completion of their redemption.' And hence it became a standing rule over the whole Church to read the Acts in these fifty days of Pentecost, as appears from many other places of Chrysostom [9], Austin [10], Cassian [11], and the fourth Council of Toledo [12], which because

[8] Hom. 63. Cur in Pentecoste Acta legantur. tom. 5. p. 949. See b. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. v. 5. p. 55. nn. 23, 24.

[9] Hom. 33. in Gen. p. 478. See b. 13. ch. 6. s. 2. v. 4. p. 449. n. 37. —Hom. 47. t. 5. p. 637. See b. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. v. 5. p. 56. n. 25.—Hom. 48. in Inscript. Altar. t. 5. p. 650. See ibid. n. 26.

[10] Tractat. 6. in Ioan. t. 9. p. 24. See ibid. p. 54. n. 22.—Conf. Hom. 83. de Divers. [al. Serm. 227.] (t. 5. p. 973 e.] In Actibus Apostolorum advertite, quando legitur. Modo incipit liber ipse legi. Hodie cœpit liber, qui vocatur Actuum Apostolorum.—Hom. 93. de Divers. [al. Serm. 315.] (ibid. p. 1261 e.) Ipse liber incipit legi a Dominico Paschæ, sicut se consuetudo habet ecclesiæ. In hoc ergo libro, cui titulus est, Actus Apostolorum, audistis, &c. Ed.]

[11] Instit. l. 2. c. 6. See b. 13. c. 10. s. 14. v. 4. p. 571., the latter part of n. 67.

[12] C. 16. See b. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. v. 5. p. 57. n. 29.

I have had occasion to recite at large in a former Book[13], I forbear to repeat in this place.

3. During this season likewise they generally prohibited all fasting and kneeling at prayers, as on the Lord's-day, because at this time they more especially celebrated with joy the memorial of our Saviour's resurrection. This is plain from those words of Tertullian[14], 'We count it unlawful to fast, or to worship kneeling on the Lord's-day; and we enjoy the same immunity from Easter to Pentecost.' Epiphanius[15] says the same, that though the ascetics of the Church fasted on the stationary days, that is, Wednesdays and Fridays, or other times, yet they neither fasted nor kneeled on the Lord's-day, or the whole fifty days of Pentecost. And this custom about kneeling was made a standing rule by the Council of Nice: for 'Whereas,' say they[16], 'there are some who kneel on the Lord's-day, and the fifty days of Pentecost; that an uniform way of worship may be observed in all Churches, it seems good to the holy synod that prayer be made to God standing.' Yet all Churches did not exactly conform to this rule, nor observe these customs so precisely in Pentecost, as they did on the Lord's-day. For St. Austin[17] says he was not certain that these things were in use in all Churches, either in Pentecost or the Lord's-day. And Cassian[18] says more expressly, that in the monasteries of Syria, they had no great regard to this rule, which forbad kneeling at prayers or fasting in Pentecost, though their neighbours, the Egyptians, were very precise and punctual in the observation of both those customs; which made him more curious to inquire into the ground and reason

All fasting and kneeling at prayers prohibited at this season, as on the Lord's-day.

[13] B. 14. ch. 3. s. 3. See the preceding notes.

[14] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Die Dominico jejunium nefas ducimus, vel de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschæ in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.

[15] Expos. Fid. in 22. (t. 1. p. 1105 a.) ... *Δίχα μόνης τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ὅλης τῶν πεντήκοντα ἡμερῶν, ἐν αἷς οὔτε γονυκλισίαι γίνονται, οὔτε νηστεία προστέτακται.*

[16] C. 20. (t. 2. p. 37 e.) *Ἐπειδή τινές εἰσιν ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ γόνυ κλίνοντες, καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραις ὑπὲρ τῶν πάντα ἐν πάσῃ παροικίᾳ φυλάττεσθαι, ἑστῶτας ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀποδιδόναι τῷ Θεῷ.*

[17] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 17. (t. 2. p. 141 e.) Ut autem stantes in illis diebus, et omnibus Dominicis oremus, utrum ubique servetur ignoro.

[18] Collat. 21. c. 11. (p. 560.).... Cœpimus diligentius percontari, cur apud eos [Ægyptios] tanta observantia caveretur, ne quis penitus totis Quinquagesimæ diebus vel genua in oratione curvaret, vel usque ad horam nonam jejunare præsumeret, eoque id diligentius perscrutabamur, quod nequaquam hoc tanta cautione servari in Syriæ monasteriis videramus.

of these observations: and their answer was[18], 'that this festival being kept in honour and memory of our Saviour's resurrection, it was a time of more than ordinary joy; and fasting and kneeling were incongruous at such a season, because they were indications of deep mourning, and a more than ordinary repentance: therefore they neither fasted nor prayed kneeling on these days, or the Lord's-day, but sung praises and hallelujahs to God, in honour and thankfulness for our Saviour's resurrection.'

This custom of singing *Hallelujah!* in many Churches was peculiar to this season; but in some Churches it was used upon other occasions. Of which the reader may find a full account in a former Book[19], where we treat of the psalmody of the Church.

nd all ublic ames and age-lays: but ot plead-ng at law rbidden, r bodily bour.

4. To proceed with the present festival, we may observe further, that it was of so great esteem and veneration, that Theodosius Junior, a pious prince, thought it proper to forbid all public games and diversions, as well of the theatre as the circus, during this whole season, 'because this was a time of more solemn worship, when the minds of Christians ought to be wholly employed in the service of God, and commemorating of those wonderful miracles that were wrought in confirmation of the Gospel by the hand of the Apostles,' as he words it in his law[20] made for this purpose. But business of law and administration of justice was a more necessary thing than sports and pastimes; and therefore there was no cessation of those enjoined at this season, but only in the first week after Easter, which was reckoned into the Paschal festival. As soon as this was over, the law was open again, and all actions commenced afresh, as at other times, which is evident from that discourse of St. Austin, which he preached on the *Dominica in Albis*, or *Octaves of Easter*, where he says[21], 'The days of vacation are now past, and those of convening, exactions, and lawsuits succeed in their room.' So that in this respect the remainder

[18] Ibid. c. 20. (p. 566.) Ideo namque in istis [al. ipsis] diebus nec [in] genua in oratione curvantur, quia inflexio genuum velut pœnitentiæ ac luctus judicium.

[19] B. 14. ch. 2. s. 4. v. 5. p. 35.

[20] Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. See ch. 2. s. 4. p. 248. n. 88.

[21] Serm. 19. ex 40. a Sirmond. edit. t. 10. p. 811. [al. Serm. 259.] (t. 5. p. 1064 b.) Peracti sunt dies feriati, succedent jam illi conventionum, exactionum, litigiorum.

of these fifty days was inferior to the other great festivals; but this was the only thing in which there appears to be any distinction or difference in law made between them. And in regard to ecclesiastical affairs, they were observed with almost the same religious solemnity as the other festivals, as appears from what has now been said upon them: only some learned men make a just remark, that the observation of this solemnity did not oblige men, especially those of the poorer sort, to a strict abstinence from bodily labour. For this was a rule only for the Lord's-day, and some of the greater festivals, as appears from the author of the Constitutions, who, speaking of the days on which servants were to rest from their labour[22], mentions the Lord's-day, and the Sabbath, and the Nativity of Christ, and Epiphany, and the Great Week in Lent, and Easter-week, and Ascension-day, and Pentecost, as it signifies the particular day of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, but says nothing of Pentecost in the larger acceptation, as it signifies the whole fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide.

The Council of Eliberis has a pretty severe canon[23] against some who kept Pentecost at a wrong season, not fifty, but forty days after Easter. But it does not clearly appear that they intended the whole fifty days should be observed, but only the particular day of Pentecost at its proper season. Or if they intended more, yet Albaspinæus[24] thinks they made no rule

[22] L. 8. c. 33. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 415.) ... Τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν ἀργείτωσαν, διὰ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, τὴν δωρηθεῖσαν τοῖς πιστεύσασιν εἰς Χριστόν.

[23] C. 43. (t. 1. p. 975 c.) Pravam institutionem emendari placuit, juxta auctoritatem Scripturarum, ut cuncti diem Pentecostes post Pascha celebremus, non Quadragesimam, sed [al. nisi] Quinquagesimam. Qui non fecerit, novam hæresim induxisse notetur.

[24] In loc. (ibid. p. 1000 e.) Non omnino liquet hoc canone decretum, diem duntaxat Pentecostes, an quinquaginta post Pascha dies celebrandos. Vulgaris lectio de solo Pentecostes die, emendata totos quinquaginta dies festivos habendos statuisse videtur, his adjectis, *non Quadragesimam, nisi Quinquagesimam.* Præterea certum est superioribus temporibus Pentecostes non unicum diem, a Paschate ad Pentecosten totos dies a Christianis celebratos. Tertullianus: *Excerpe singulas festivitates nationum, vix Pentecosten implere poterunt.* Nicænum quoque Concilium, eosdem quinquaginta dies solemnes fuisse indicat, vetitis adgeniculationibus. Quapropter in eam potius sententiam hunc canonem acciperem, ut dies quinquaginta, quam unicum Pentecostes diem observandum statuat. Verum qua ceremonia quinquaginta illi dies traducerentur, non liquet: non cessatione operarum; neque enim credibile videbitur, tenuiorum sane et inopum causa, quos ab intermissione laboris Pagani facile internoscere potuissent. Quapropter potius existimarim, quantum ego conjicere possum, dies

about keeping these days as days of perfect vacation from bodily labour, but only days of relaxation from fasting and kneeling, and days of public joy and thanksgiving, and holding religious assemblies for prayer and receiving the eucharist, which probably was administered every day during this whole season. And in these things consisted the observation of Pentecost in this larger acceptation.

ascen-day; tiquity bser-n.

5. In the course of this long continued festival of Pentecost we are to take more special notice of one particular day, before we come to Whitsunday; that is, of the feast of our Saviour's ascension or assumption into heaven. The observation of this festival was so ancient, that St. Austin could derive its original from no other fountain, but either apostolical institution, or the general agreement of the Church in some plenary Council. 'For those things,' says he[25], 'which are received and observed over all the world, not as written in Scripture, but as handed down to us by tradition, we conceive to be either instituted by the Apostles themselves, or some numerous Councils, whose authority is of very great use in the Church. Such are the anniversary solemnities of our Saviour's passion, and resurrection, and ascension into heaven, and the coming of the Holy Ghost from heaven.' It is certain, therefore, the feast of Ascension was generally observed all over the Church long before St. Austin's time. Chrysostom often speaks of it under the name of Ἀνάληψις, or our Lord's *Assumption into heaven.* For not to mention those two Sermons in Sir H. Savil's edition upon the Ascension[26], which are reckoned spurious[27], he has one upon the Assumption[28], the credit of which was never

illos celebrari et agitari consuevisse, publicis de more missarum sacrificiis, eucharistiæ quoque sumptione sanctissime obita, aut elogiis recitandis. Addo etiam commune quoddam et publicum gaudium, quo elati jejunare desinerent, Deumque stantes, omissa genuflectione, laudibus et hymnis extollerent, et benedicerent.

[25] Ep. 118. [al. 54.] ad Januar. c. 1. (t. 2. p. 124 b.) Illa autem quæ non scripta, sed tradita custodimus, quæ quidem toto terrarum orbe observantur, datur intelligi, vel ab ipsis Apostolis, vel plenariis Conciliis, quorum est in ecclesia saluberrima auctoritas, commendata atque statuta retineri. Sicuti quod Domini passio, et resurrectio, et ascensio in cœlum, et adventus de cœlo Spiritus Sancti anniversaria solemnitate celebrantur.

[26] Homm. 63 et 74. (Ed. Savil. t. 7. p. 426 et p. 466.) Εἰς Ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ— Εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν Ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[27] [Vid. Ed. Bened. Paris. 1718–38. t. 3. p. 781. et t. 11. p. 800., inter Spuria. Ed.]

[28] Hom. 35. in Assumpt. (Ed.

called in question[29], wherein he styles this festival 'the illustrious and refulgent day of our Lord's assumption into heaven.' And in another Homily upon Whitsunday[30], recounting the great solemnities that had just gone before, he says, 'We have lately celebrated our Saviour's passion, his resurrection, and then his *ἄνοδον εἰς οὐρανὸν, his return to heaven,*' that is, the feast of his ascension. In like manner the author of the Constitutions[31] puts Ascension-day into the number of the great Christian festivals, because on this day our Saviour's economy on earth was completed.

Among the Cappadocians the day was called *Episozomene;* for so Leo Allatius[32] tells us he found it noted in a manuscript of Gregory Nyssen's works. And one of Chrysostom's Homilies[33] is said to be preached *Κυριακῇ Σωζομένης*, or *Ἐπισωζο-*

Savil. t. 5. p. 595.) See the words in the next note.

[29] [Vid. Ed. Paris. 1616. t. 5. p. 533., sive juxt. Ed. Francofurt. 1697–8. Hom. 38. t. 5. p. 477. Item ap. Ed. Bened. (t. 2. p. 447 a.) *Νῦν ὅτε τοῦ Σταυρωθέντος τὴν Ἀνάληψιν ἄγομεν, τὴν φαιδρὰν ταύτην καὶ ἐξαστράπτουσαν ἡμέραν, κ.τ.λ.* Ed.]

[30] Hom. 37. in Pentecost. p. 560. (t. 2. p. 469 a.) ..... *Πρῶτον* [al. *πρώην*] *μὲν οὖν ἑορτάσαμεν τὸν σταυρὸν, τὸ πάθος, τὴν ἀνάστασιν, μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸν ἄνοδον τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

[31] L. 8. c. 33. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 415.) .... *Τὴν Ἀνάληψιν ἀργείτωσαν, διὰ τὸ πέρας τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας.*

[32] De Dominic. et Hebdomad. Græcor. n. 28. (p. 1460.) Ascensio quoque Domini apud Cappadoces *Ἐπισωζομένη* dicebatur. Erat annotatum in manuscripto codice Gregorii Nysseni: *Τῷ ἐπιχωρίῳ τῶν Καππαδοκῶν ἔθει Ἐπισωζομένη λέγεται Ἀνάληψις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.* Legiturque inter Andriantas Chrysostomi Homilia, *Τῇ Κυριακῇ τῆς Ἐπισωζομένης.* Latinis hæc Dominica est, *Quinta post Pascha.* Hebdomas ista *ἀναλήψιμος*, a festivitate *Ἀναλήψεως*, vocatur a Theodoro Studita.

[33] [*Τῇ Κυριακῇ τῆς Σωζομένης* according to the old edition of Fronto Ducæus and the Frankfort edition of 1697–8. But Montfaucon (t. 2. p. 188.) and Savil (t. 6. p. 588.) read *τῆς Ἐπισωζομένης.* Upon which the annotation (ad Hom. 58. q. est *Περὶ Ἀνδριάντων* 19. ibid. p. 809.) observes, *Hoc est Dominica proxima post Pascha, Dominica in Albis.* But the Benedictine editor (ubi supra, not. ad tit.) remarks, 'Erat autem *Ἐπισωζομένη* dies Ascensionis, ut ait Simeon Allatius. *Κυριακὴ* vero *τῆς Ἐπισωζομένης* Dominica quinta post Pascha. Quod vero id difficultate non vacet pluribus ea de re disseruimus in Monito. Certe hic alia prorsus Dominica indicari videtur.' The Monitum referred to (Præfat. ad t. 2. p. 7.) is as follows, which also combats the opinion of Sir H. Savil's editors: 'Decima nona Homilia est, ut titulus habet, *Τῇ Κυριακῇ τῆς Ἐπισωζομένης*, vel ut legit Fronto Ducæus, *τῆς Σωζομένης*, Dominica Servatæ. Apud Cappadoces *Ἐπισωζομένην* esse Ascensionem Domini ait Allatius libro de Dominicis et Hebdomadibus Græcorum, cui ibidem addit Dominicam *Ἐπισωζομένης* esse quintam post Pascha, eam scilicet quæ præcedit Ascensionem Domini. Savilius autem ait esse Dominicam in Albis, nescio unde id expiscatus. At non dubium videtur esse illam aliquam ex Dominicis postremis Quadra-

μένης, which the curators of Sir H. Savil's edition take to be *Dominica in Albis*, or the Sunday after Easter; but Suicerus[34] and Allatius[35] understand it of the Sunday after Ascension-day, which from thence took its denomination. Why Ascension-day was so called is not very easy to conjecture. Perhaps it might be, because by our Saviour's assumption into heaven again, the whole economy of his incarnation and *the world's redemption was now completed*, as the author of the Constitutions[36] words it. And Chrysostom[37] much after the same manner says, 'On this day God and man were reconciled together; on this day that ancient enmity was destroyed, and that long war ended; on this day an admirable and unexpected peace was restored to us. After God in his anger had destroyed man and beast from off the earth by an universal deluge, we that were unworthy of the earth were this day exalted to heaven; we that were not worthy to reign below, were advanced to a kingdom above. We ascended above the heavens, and took possession of a royal throne; and that nature of ours, against which the Cherubims were set to guard Paradise, was this day set above the Cherubims.' He means, that Christ, as the first-fruits of our nature in perfection, was exalted unto heaven; and all his members in some measure now partake of that glory, and hope in due time to meet him in the clouds, and to be translated to the same place, whither their forerunner is gone before them.

This is the best account I can give at present of the name *Episozomene*, and the application of it to the celebrated festival of our Saviour's ascension or assumption into heaven. I need

gesimæ, sed, ut putat Tillemontius, Dominicam Passionis, cui ego potius astipulor. ED.]

[34] Thes. Eccles. voce, 'Επισωζομένη. (t. 1. p. 1194.) Quid 'Επισωζομένη sit, docet Leo Allatius de Dominicis et Hebdomadibus Græcorum: Ascensio apud Cappadoces, &c.

[35] Ubi supra. See n. 32, preceding.

[36] Ubi supra. See n. 31, preceding.

[37] Hom. 35. in Ascens. t. 5. pp. 535, 536. (t. 2. p. 448 e. et 449 d.) *Σήμερον γὰρ καταλλαγαὶ τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γεγόνασι γένος. Σήμερον ἡ χρονία ἔχθρα κατελύθη, καὶ ὁ μακρὸς πόλεμος* [*ἀνῃρέθη*. Bened.] *σήμερον εἰρήνη θαυμασία τις ἐπανῆλθεν, οὐδέποτε προσδοκηθεῖσα πρότερον· τίς γὰρ ἂν ἤλπισεν, ὅτι Θεὸς ἀνθρώπῳ καταλλάττεσθαι ἔμελλεν;.. Ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς, οἱ τῆς γῆς ἀνάξιοι φανέντες, σήμερον εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνήχθημεν· οἱ μηδὲ τῆς κάτω ἀρχῆς ὄντες ἄξιοι, πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀνέβημεν τὴν ἄνω· ὑπερέβημεν τοὺς οὐρανούς, ἐπιλαβόμεθα τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ βασιλικοῦ· καὶ ἡ φύσις, δι' ἣν ἐφύλαττε τὸν Παράδεισον τὰ Χερουβὶμ, αὕτη ἐπάνω τῶν Χερουβὶμ κάθηται σήμερον.*

stand now to inquire into the manner of its observation; being in the midst of Pentecost, it certainly had all the so- nity that belonged to that festival, and never passed with- a proper discourse, to excite men to elevate their souls, ascend with Christ in heart and mind to heaven, in hopes btaining it as their proper mansion both for body and soul eafter to all eternity. But as for any such ridiculous pa- ntry as has been used in some places to represent Christ's ension in the church, by drawing up an image of Christ to roof of the church, and then casting down the image of an in flames, to represent his falling as lightning from hea- , with abundance more of the same kind, (which the curious ler may find described by Hospinian[38] out of Naogeorgus,) ancient Church was wholly a stranger to it; this being the ntion of later ages, when superstitious ceremonies had de- ed religion into sport and ridicule, and made the great gs of God's law look more like ludicrous pomp and comedy a venerable mysteries of the Christian faith. But I return he ancient Church.

Of Pentecost in the stricter sense, as denoting the festival of the de-

. The conclusion of this great festival season was Pentecost, en in the stricter sense for that particular day commonly ed *Whit-Sunday*, or *Pentecost*, when they commemorated descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles; which hap- ing upon the day which the Jews called *Pentecost*, or *the*

De Fest. Christian. p. 72. (p. col. sinistr.) In hoc Christi , quo memoria Ascensionis isti in cœlos, et complementi tis ac redemptionis nostræ, celebrari debebat, multa ridicula, immo profana et impia, in Papatu hodie fiunt, de quibus Thomas Naogeorgus, libro 4. Regni Pontificii, ita canit:

Post venit illa dies, superas qua Christus ad arces
Scandit, quam celebrant itidem potuque ciboque
Prælargo: qua cuique aliqua est comedenda volucris,
Haud scio, quapropter. Post prandia templa petuntur.
Truncus ibi, qui tempus ad hoc est visus in ara,
In summum trahitur, demisso fune, lacunar,
Cœtu sacrificum deducente atque canente.
Inde statim Satanæ præceps perturpis imago
Dejicitur, nonnunquam ardens, diruptaque prorsus.
Expectant pueri cupide, virgisque jacentem
Concidunt, lacerantque in parvas denique partes.
Posthæc dejicitur panis, quem barbara turba
Nuncupat Oblata[s]: cui sæpe admixta papyrus
Imponit pueris: finiunt magno omnia risu.
Ex laqueari etiam certa syphonibus arte
Ejaculantur aquas, si quem tinxisse laborant,
Atque ita finitur magno fabella cachinno.

scent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles.

fiftieth day after the Passover, (a day of great note among the Jews, both for the memorial of the Law delivered at Mount Sinai, and also for the gathering and bringing in of their harvest,) it retained the same name of *Pentecost* among the Christians; though they kept it not as a Jewish feast, but only as a commemoration of the glorious effusion of the Spirit in the gift of tongues, and other miraculous powers, made at this time upon the disciples. Hence it had also the name of *ἡμέρα Πνεύματος, the day of the Holy Ghost,* as we find in Nazianzen[38] and others. And some learned men think[39] it was hence called *Whit-Sunday,* partly because of those vast diffusions of light and knowledge, which upon this day were shed upon the Apostles, in order to the enlightening of the world; but principally, because this being one of the stated times of baptism in the ancient Church, they who were baptized put on *white garments*[40], in token of that pure and innocent course of life they had now engaged in.

The original of this feast is by some carried as high as the Apostles. Epiphanius[41] was of opinion, that St. Paul meant it in those words, when he said, "he hastened to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost." (Acts 20, 16.) But, because interpreters generally take that in another sense, we will lay no stress upon it. However it is certain this feast was observed in the time of Origen: for he speaks of it in his Books against Celsus[42]: as does also Tertullian[43] before him, and Irenæus

[38] Orat. 44. de Pentecost. (t. 1. p. 712 b.)...Τίμησον τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ Πνεύματος.

[39] Cave, Primitive Christianity, part 1. ch. 7. p. 192. (p. 93.) This feast is, by us, styled Whit-Sunday, partly because of those vast diffusions of light and knowledge, which upon this day were shed upon the Apostles, in order to the enlightening of the world; but principally because this, as also Easter, being the stated time for baptism in the ancient Church, those, who were baptized, put on white garments, in token of that pure and innocent course of life they had now engaged in: this white garment they wore till the next Sunday after, and then laid it aside.

[40] See b. 12. ch. 4. s. 1. v. 4. p. 234. nn. 39, seqq.

[41] Hær. 75. Aërian. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 910 b.) Ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα αὐτοῦ, καὶ διασκωπήσωμεν. καὶ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα πρῶτον εἴπωμεν, Ὡς, φησὶ, τὸ Πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη Χριστός. Ἴδωμεν αὐτὸν τὸν εἰπόντα εἰ οὐκ ἐπετέλει. Καί φησιν, Ἔσπευδεν, ὅπως ποιήσῃ τὴν Πεντεκοστὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ· ποίαν δὲ τὴν Πεντηκοστὴν Παῦλος, εἰ μὴ Πάσχα, ἐπετέλεσε;

[42] Cont. Cels. l. 8. p. 392. (t. 1. p. 758 f.) Ἐὰν δέ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρῃ τὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν Κυριακῶν, ἢ Παρασκευῶν, ἢ τοῦ Πάσχα, ἢ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, δι' ἡμερῶν γινόμενα, κ. τ. λ.

[43] De Idolol. c. 14. See before, s. 1. n. 1, preceding.

before them both in his Book concerning Easter, as the author of the Questions under the name of Justin Martyr[44] informs us, where, speaking of the custom of standing at prayers on the Lord's-day and Pentecost, he says, 'This custom obtained from the days of the Apostles, as Irenæus, bishop of Lyons and martyr, testifies in his Book of Easter, where he also makes mention of Pentecost, in which we kneel not, because it is equivalent to the Lord's-day, being a symbol of the Lord's resurrection.' St. Austin[45] says, 'The Law was written by the finger of God, and given to Moses on this day; and that was a type of the Holy Ghost, called *the finger of God* in the Gospel, which Christ promised to his disciples as a comforter, and sent to them on the fiftieth day after his passion and resurrection. And all such eminent facts, as were done upon certain days, were annually celebrated in the Church, that the anniversary feast might preserve the useful and necessary memorial of them.' This festival of Pentecost in particular was observed the whole week after till the Octaves, or Sunday following, without fasting or kneeling, and then the Church returned to her usual stationary fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays, and in some places a strict fast all the week succeeded this festival, as we learn from the second Synod of Tours[46]: but this was a new institution, as was also the Rogation-fast for three days in Ascension-week; of which more hereafter in their proper place[47].

CHAP. VII.

Of the festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs.

The original of the festivals of martyrs.

1. We have hitherto considered those festivals which peculiarly related to our Lord's economy on earth, and were ob-

[44] Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox. quæst. 115. (p. 468 d.) Ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δὲ χρόνων ἡ τοιαύτη συνήθεια ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν, κακῶς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Εἰρηναῖος, ὁ μάρτυς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος Λουγδούνου, ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα λόγῳ, ἐν ᾧ μέμνηται καὶ περὶ τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἐν ᾗ οὐ κλίνομεν γόνυ, ἐπειδὴ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς Κυριακῆς.

[45] Cont. Faust. l. 32. c. 12. (t. 8. p. 456 c.) Pentecosten etiam, id est, a passione et resurrectione Domini quinquagesimum diem celebramus, quo nobis Sanctum Spiritum Paracletum, quem promiserat, misit: quod futurum etiam per Judæorum Pascha significatum est, cum quinquagesimo die post celebrationem ovis occisæ, Moses digito Dei scriptam Legem accepit in monte, &c.

[46] C. 18. [al. 17.] (t. 5. p. 856 e.) De Pascha usque Quinquagesimam, exceptis rogationibus, omni die [fratribus] prandium præparetur. Post Quinquagesimam tota hebdomada exacte jejunetur.

[47] See b. 21. ch. 2. s. 8.

served over the whole Church as memorials of the great acts of his life and death: but besides these there were another sort of festivals instituted by the Church in honour of the Apostles and martyrs, by whose actions and sufferings Christianity was chiefly propagated and maintained in the world. The first original of these festivals is not certainly known, but learned men[47] commonly carry it as high as the second century. And there is plain evidence for this: for they are not only frequently spoken of in Cyprian and Tertullian, but long before in the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna to the Church of Philomelium, recorded by Eusebius[48], where, speaking of the martyrdom of Polycarp their bishop, who suffered about the year 168, they tell their brethren, 'that they intended by God's permission to meet at his tomb, and celebrate his birthday, (meaning the day of his martyrdom,) with joy and gladness, as well for the memory of the sufferer, as for example to posterity.'

Why called their *natalitia*, or *birthday*.

2. Where we may observe their peculiar phrase in styling the day of his martyrdom his birthday: which was according to the usual style of the Church in this affair: for so Tertullian[49] and others[50] use the words *natalitia* and *natales*, meaning not their natural birth, but *their nativity to a glorious*

[47] Vid. Hospinian. de Fest. Christian. c. 4. p. 14. (p. 22. col. dextr.) Memoriarum etiam martyrum ex omnibus fere horum temporum auctoribus fit mentio, et circa annum Christi 170. primum institutæ videntur. Non tamen ab initio Feriæ seu Festa, sed Memoriæ tantum fuerint, in quibus passio et constantia martyrum prædicabatur, ut fideles, qui præsentes erant, ad similem virtutem incitarentur; deinde ad suæ quisque vocationis labores revertebatur.—Cave, Primitive Christianity, part 1. ch. 7. p. 198. (p. 96.) The first that I remember to have met with is that of Polycarp, whose martyrdom is placed by Eusebius anno 168, under the third persecution, concerning whose death and sufferings the Church of Smyrna, of which he was bishop, giving an account to the Church of Philomelium, and especially of the place where they had honourably entombed his bones. They do profess that, so far as the malice of their enemies would permit them, and they prayed God nothing might hinder it, they would assemble in that place, and celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom with joy and gladness.

[48] L. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 171. 18.) Ἔνθα ὡς δυνατὸν ἡμῖν συναγομένοις ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ χαρᾷ, παρέξει ὁ Κύριος ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, εἴς τε τῶν προηθληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν.

[49] De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus.

[50] C. Laodic. c. 51. (t. 1. p. 1505 b.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν Τεσσαρακοστῇ μαρτύρων γενέθλιον ἐπιτελεῖν.—Ambros. Serm. 70. [al. 57.] (t. 2. append. p. 469 e. n. 1.) Depositionis [ipsa] dies *natalis* dicitur, &c.

crown in the kingdom of heaven. I have noted before in speaking of the civil festivals[51], that the *natales* or *birthdays* of the emperors often signifies not their natural, but their political birthday, or the day of their inauguration to the imperial crown: and so it was with the Church, whenever she spake of the nativities of her martyrs, she meant not the day of their natural birth, but the day wherein by suffering death they were born again to a new life, and solemnly inaugurated to a celestial kingdom and a crown of endless glory. To this purpose Peter Chrysologus[52] bids his auditors, when they hear of the birthday of a saint, 'not to imagine that it means the day of his carnal birth on earth, but the day on which he was born from earth to heaven, from labour to rest, from torments to delight and pleasure.' In this sense Tertullian[53] says, 'St. Paul was born again by a new nativity at Rome, because he suffered martyrdom there.' In like manner Prudentius[54] says, 'a martyr's birthday is the day of his passion.' And Chrysostom[55] gives the reason of this, 'because the death of a martyr is not properly a death, but an endless life; for the sake of which, all things were to be endured, and death itself to be despised.' Upon this account the ancient author under the name of Origen[56] says, 'when they celebrated the memorials of those holy

[51] Ch. 1. s. 4. p. 288.

[52] Serm. 129. (p. 189.) Natalem ergo sanctorum cum auditis, carissimi, nolite putare illum dici, quo nascuntur in terra [al. in terram] de carne, sed de terra in cœlum, de labore in requiem, de cruciatibus ad delicias, non fluxas sed fortes, et stabiles, et æternas, de mundanis risibus ad coronam et gloriam.

[53] Scorpiac. cont. Gnostic. c. 15. (p. 500 d.) Tunc Paulus civitatis Romanæ consequitur nativitatem, cum illic martyrii renascitur generositate.

[54] Peristeph. Hymn. 11. de Hippol. v. 196. (v. 1. p. 399.) Natalemque diem passio festa refert.

[55] Hom. 43. de S. Roman. t. 1. p. 577. (t. 2. p. 614 c.) ....Ὅτι μαρτύρων θάνατος οὐκ ἔστι θάνατος, ἀλλὰ ζωὴ πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσα, καὶ μάλιστά γε ὑπὲρ ταύτης πάντα ὑπομένειν χρὴ, καὶ ὅτι δεῖ καταφρονεῖν τελευτῆς.—[Cf. Hom. de S. Babyl. (ibid. p. 531 d.) ....Ὅτι θάνατος μαρτύρων οὐκ ἔστι θάνατος, ἀλλὰ ζωῆς βελτίονος ἀρχὴ, καὶ πολιτείας πνευματικωτέρας προοίμια, καὶ μετάστασις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλαττόνων πρὸς τὰ βελτίω. ED.]

[56] In Job. l. 3. t. 1. p. 437. (t. 2. p. 901 f.) Nos non nativitatis diem celebramus cum sit dolorum atque tentationum introitus, sed mortis diem celebramus, utpote omnium dolorum depositionem atque omnium tentationum effugationem. Diem mortis celebramus, quia non moriuntur hi, qui mori videntur.—Conf. Euseb. Emisen. [Episc. Gallican.] Serm. de Natali S. Genesii, (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 6. p. 670 c.) Beatorum martyrum passiones, natales vocamus dies, quando eos martyrii vita et gloriæ fides dum ingerit morti, genuit æternitati, et perpetua gaudia brevi dolore parturiit. Merito plane dicendi natales dies, per

men, they kept not their first nativity, as being the inlet to sorrow and temptation; but the day of their death, as the period of their miseries, and that which sets them beyond the reach of temptations. We celebrate the day of their death, because they die not even when they seem to die.'

These festivals usually kept at the graves of the martyrs.

3. Now these solemnities were usually celebrated at the graves or monuments of the martyrs, which, according to the custom of burying in those times, were commonly without the cities in large *cryptæ* under ground; where in times of persecution the Christians were often used to meet for safety, when they could not enjoy their churches. And in after-ages, churches were built over these graves, which were therefore called *martyria, areæ, cœmeteria, mensæ*, and *memoriæ martyrum*, as I have shown at large in a former Book[57]. To these places they resorted, whenever they celebrated the memorial of any particular martyr. Which is the reason why, in the ancient panegyrics of the Fathers upon particular martyrs, we sometimes hear them speaking of leaving the city-churches upon the anniversaries of the martyrs, and going out into the country to the monuments or memorials of the martyrs, to hold assemblies there, where the martyrs lay buried. Thus Chrysostom, in one of his Homilies upon the Martyrs[58], says, 'As before, when the festival of the Maccabees was celebrated, all the country came thronging into the city; so now, when the feast of the martyrs, who lie buried in the country, is celebrated, it was fit the whole city should be transferred thither.' And in another Homily upon St. Drosis[59] he says, 'Though they had spiritual enter-

quos illi, qui nati fuerant in hanc fragilitatis humanæ miseriam, subito renascuntur in gloriam, vitæ perennis initium de mortis fine sumentes.

[57] B. 8. ch. 1. s. 9. v. 3. p. 15.

[58] Hom. 65. t. 5. p. 972. (t. 2. p. 651 b.) Καθάπερ τῆς ἑορτῆς τῶν Μακκαβαίων ἐπιτελουμένης, πᾶσα ἡ χώρα εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐξεχύθη· οὕτω, τῆς ἑορτῆς τῶν ἐκεῖ μαρτύρων ἀγομένης, νῦν τὴν πόλιν ἅπασαν πρὸς ἐκείνους μεταστῆναι ἐχρῆν.

[59] Hom. 67. t. 5. p. 989. (ibid. p. 688 a.) Οἱ φιλόπονοι τῶν ποιμένων, ἐπειδὰν διὰ μακροῦ χειμῶνος ἴδωσι λαμπρὰν ἀκτῖνα, καὶ θερμοτέραν γενομένην ἡμέραν, τῆς μάνδρας ἐξαγαγόντες τὰ πρόβατα, πρὸς τὰς συνήθεις ἄγουσι νομάς· τούτους καὶ ὁ καλὸς ποιμὴν οὗτος μιμούμενος, τὴν ἱερὰν ταύτην ἀγέλην, καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποίμνην πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἁγίων νομὰς ἤγαγε ταύτας τὰς πνευματικάς. Κορέννυνται μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς φάτνης ἑστῶτα τὰ πρόβατα· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὰν ἔξω γένηται τῶν σηκῶν, πλείονα ἀπὸ τῶν πεδίων καρποῦνται τὴν ὠφέλειαν, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς τέρψεως κατακύπτοντα, καὶ τὴν πόαν διὰ τῶν ὀδόντων ἀποκείροντα, καθαρόν τε ἀέρα ἀναπνέοντα, καὶ πρὸς ἀκτῖνα βλέποντα διειδῆ καὶ φαιδρὰν, παρὰ λίμνας καὶ πηγὰς σκιρτῶντα καὶ ποταμοὺς· φέρει

tainment in the city, yet their going out to the saints afforded them both great profit and pleasure.'

And mostly confined to those particular churches where the martyrs suffered and lay buried.

4. Whence we may observe, that those festivals at first were not general festivals, like those of our Lord, observed over the whole Church, but chiefly celebrated in those particular churches where the martyrs suffered and lay buried. As the festival of Polycarp was chiefly celebrated at Smyrna, and that of Cyprian at Carthage, at the places where they were bishops, and suffered martyrdom: this being most for the edification of the people, to have the examples of their own martyrs, who lived and died among them, proposed to their imitation. And this is confirmed by a peculiar remark made by Sozomen[60] upon the two churches of Gaza and Constantia, in Palestine, 'that though they were not above twenty furlongs distant from one another, yet they had each of them their own bishop and clergy, and *ἰδίᾳ πανηγύρεις μαρτύρων, distinct festivals of their own particular martyrs.*' To this purpose it was customary for every Church to have her own *Fasti*, or *Kalendar of Martyrs;* and public notaries to take the account of what was said and done to or by the martyrs at their passions; out of which general Martyrologies were made by men in after-ages, collecting all these particular accounts into one body, which Valesius[61] and Pagi[62] own to be the first original of the Roman and all

δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ γῆ τινα τέρψιν, τοῖς ἄνθεσι καλλωπιζομένη πάντοθεν. Οὐκ ἐπ' ἐκείνων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν τοῦτο πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ὠφέλειαν. Πλήρης μὲν γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔνδον ἡ τράπεζα τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐδεσμάτων παρέκειτο, ἀλλ' ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους ἔξοδος τούτους ἔχει τινὰ καὶ ψυχαγωγίαν, καὶ κέρδος τῆς ψυχαγωγίας οὐκ ἔλαττον, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ καθαρὸν τὸν ἀέρα ἀναπνέομεν· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τὰ τῶν γενναίων τούτων κατορθώματα βλέπομεν, οὐ παρὰ ποταμοὺς ὑδάτων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ ποταμοὺς χαρισμάτων σκιρτῶντες· οὐ κατακύπτοντες καὶ πόαν κείροντες τοῖς ὀδοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ μαρτύρων ἀρετὰς ἀναλεγόμενοι· οὐχὶ γῆν ὁρῶντες καλλωπιζομένην ἄνθεσιν, ἀλλὰ σώματα βλέποντες χαρίσμασι βρύοντα πνευματικοῖς. [These two Homilies on the Martyrs and St. Drosis are not exstant in Savil's Edition. Ed.]

[60] L. 5. c. 3. (v. 2. p. 184. 1.) *Ἑκατέρα ἰδίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον καὶ κλῆρον ἔχει, καὶ πανηγύρεις μαρτύρων, καὶ μνείας τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένων ἱερέων.*

[61] De Martyrologio Romano, ad calc. Euseb. (t. 1. p. 792. 46.) Nobiliores ecclesiæ suos semper fastos habuerunt, in quibus et episcoporum nomina et martyrum, qui apud ipsos passi fuerant, natale dies præscripti habebantur, &c.

[62] Critic. in Baron. an. 64. n. 6. [See the foregoing note, and add the following remarks of Pagi himself: (t. 1. p. 49.) De fastis vero in quibus singula ecclesiæ descriptos habebant natales martyrum suorum, &c. Sic etiam Romana ecclesia jam inde a primis temporibus suos habuit festos, in quibus et depositiones episcoporum et natales martyrum erant consignati; quæ Kalendaria posterior ætas vocavit, &c. Verum hæc Kalendaria longe a Mar-

other Martyrologies, which are not so ancient as the Kalendars. For such Kalendars and Public Acts were originally kept by every Church to preserve the memorial of their martyrs: as is evident from Tertullian[63], who speaks of the Church having her *census* and *fasti*, that is, as Rigaltius[64] and others well explain it, her *rolls* or *accounts* both of her expenses on the poor, and the Acts or Passions of her martyrs. To which Cyprian[65] also plainly refers, when, being in exile, he sent to his clergy to be careful in setting down the days on which the martyrs suffered, that there might be an anniversary commemoration made of them.

Usual to read the Acts or Passions of the Martyrs on their proper festivals.

5. These Acts or Passions of the Martyrs, when they were carefully taken and preserved genuine without corruption, were commonly read in the Church upon the anniversary commemoration and proper festival of the martyr. The third Council of Carthage[66], which forbids all other books to be read in the Church besides the Canonical Scripture, excepts the Passions of the Martyrs, as books that might be read on their anniversary days of commemoration. St. Austin, and Pope Leo, and Gelasius, often mention the reading of such histories in the African and Roman Churches. Cæsarius Arelatensis, and Alcimus Avitus, and Ferreolus, speak of the same in the French Churches. And some think, not improbably, that such sort of Histories and Passions of the Martyrs, had particularly the name of *Legenda, Legends*, upon this account, because they were used *to be read* in the Church on the festivals of martyrs: but the fabulous writers of Lives, such as the author of the *Golden Legend*, and other monkish impostors, have since

tyrologiis differunt, &c. Singulæ enim ecclesiæ, ut dixi, sua habuere Kalendaria, &c. Martyrologia vero non unius loci propria, sed totius ecclesiæ communia, &c. Ex pluribus enim diversarum urbium Kalendariis unum compositum est Martyrologium. Itaque Kalendaria Martyrologiis vetustiora sunt, &c. Ed.]

[63] De Cor. Mil. c. 13. (p. 109.)... Habes tuos census, tuos fastos, &c.

[64] [In loc. (ibid. n. 6.) Fasti erant libri continentes totius anni rationem et celebritates. Cum respectu ad hos loquitur Tertullianus: *In ecclesia quoque sunt fasti; ne tu municipiorum fastos et solemnitates cura.* Notandus sane locus ad morem ecclesiæ, quæ conferebat natalitia, id est, obitus martyrum in fastos, quos fastos ecclesiastico nomine vocamus *martyrologia.* Ed.]

[65] Ep. 37. [al. 12.] ad Cler. p. 27. (p. 188.) Denique et dies eorum quibus excedunt, annotate, ... ut celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum.

[66] C. 47. (t. 2. p. 1175 b.) Liceat legi Passiones Martyrum, cum anniversarii eorum dies celebrantur.

written the Lives of saints and martyrs in such a scandalous manner, as to alter the signification of the good old word, and make *a legend* pass for a romantic fiction, and mere imposture. Of which learned men, even in the Romish Church, such as Ludovicus Vives[67], and Melchior Canus[68], and Papebrochius[69], and Pagi[70], have made frequent and just complaints; confessing, 'that even their Breviaries and Passionals are often filled with such monstrous fables, as would make a wise man blush to hear or read them in the public offices of the Church; and which they desire heartily to see perfectly reformed.' Particularly Pagi exposes the fiction of Ursula[71], and her eleven thousand companions, all virgins, said to be martyred at Cologne at one time under Cyricius, a Pope that never was in being; and he tells us the Roman Martyrology and Breviary have dropped the number as an incredible fiction; as also did the Cologne Editors, and the School of the Sorbonne, retaining the name of Ursula, but being ashamed of her eleven thousand companions, notwithstanding that Hermannus Crombach wrote a large volume, called *Ursula Vindicata*[72], to defend this monstrous fable.

It were easy to give many other such instances, but this one is sufficient to show the difference between the modern Passionals, and the simplicity of those of the ancient Church, the reading of which was one part of their solemn exercise upon these festivals.

[67] [De Tradendis Disciplinis, l. 5. (p. 260.) See before, b. 14. ch. 4. s. 18. v. 5. p. 146. n. 47. Ed.]

[68] [Loc. Theolog. l. 11. c. 6. p. 533. de Hum. Hist. Auctor. p. 238. col. 2. See before, ibid. p. 147. n. 48. Ed.]

[69] Conat. Histor. Chronolog. dissert. 7. n. 7. (p. 43.) Hæc autem narrantur cum circumstantiis et formulis tam peregrinis, ne dicam fatuis, ut nequeam animo comprehendere, &c.

[70] Critic. in Baron. an. 302. nn. 18 et 19. [al. 20 et 21.] (t. 1. p. 326, 327.) Ad hæc, Acta illa referunt, &c. . . . . Alia etiam in iisdem Actis narrantur, cum circumstantiis et formulis ita peregrinis, ut mirum sit ea in compilationibus Conciliorum absque debita censura tolerari.—Ibid. n. 21. (p. 327.) Nam quoad Breviarium, non censeri debent exploratæ et inconcussæ auctoritate quæcunque eidem sunt inserta, &c. [Conf. ibid. nn. 22, 23. Ed.]

[71] Ibid. ad an. 383. n. 3. [al. 5 et 6.] (p. 561.) Per hæc tempora S. Ursula cum sociis, &c.—Conf. sub fin. n. 6. . . . . Sed harum numerus incertus, pluraque ad eam historiam pertinentia prorsus fabulosa, &c.

[72] [Crombach, a Jesuit, born at Cologne in 1598. His work alluded to, *Ursula Vindicata sive Vita et Martyrium Ursulæ et Sociarum* 11,000 *Virginum*, was published at Cologne, 1647. fol. See Winer's Handbook of Theological Literature, Lips. 1838. v. 1. col. 795, and v. 2. col. 483. Ed.]

nd to ake anegyrical ations pon them.

6. To these they commonly added a panegyrical oration or sermon of their own composing, in commendation of the virtues of the martyr, to excite their audience, which was usually very great upon such occasions, to the imitation of them. We have a great many instances of such orations in Chrysostom, Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Austin, Ambrose, Leo, Chrysologus, and others. Where the whole design of the orator is so to extol the excellencies of the saint, as to inflame his auditory with the love of his admirable virtues. This was the great end and design of keeping these festivals, and of their meeting together upon such occasions, partly to pay a due respect and honour to the memory of the dead, and partly to engage themselves to imitate such great and brave examples. It is thus the Church of Smyrna in their Epistle to the Church of Philomelium tell their brethren, they intended annually to meet at Polycarp's tomb, and celebrate his birthday with joy and gladness, as well for the memory of the sufferer, as for example to posterity: but as for any other honour of religious worship, which their enemies the Jews suggested they would be inclined to give him, they declared they had no such intention: for they could never be induced either to forsake Christ who suffered for the salvation of the whole world, or to worship any other: 'Him[73], as being the Son of God, we worship and adore: but the martyrs, as the disciples and followers of the Lord, we love with a deserved affection, for their exceeding great love toward their own King and Master; desiring to be made partners and fellow-disciples with them.' In like manner St. Austin[74] says, 'Our religion consists not in the worship of dead men: because if they lived piously, they are not esteemed such as would desire that kind of honour; but would have *him* to be worshipped by us, through whose illumination they rejoice to have us partners with them in their merit. They are

[73] Ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 171. 8.) *Τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ Υἱὸν ὄντα τοῦ Θεοῦ προσκυνοῦμεν· τοὺς δὲ μάρτυρας ὡς μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ μιμητὰς ἀγαπῶμεν ἀξίως, ἕνεκεν εὐνοίας ἀνυπερβλήτου, τῆς εἰς τὸν ἴδιον βασιλέα καὶ διδάσκαλον· ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι.*

[74] De Ver. Relig. c. 55. (t. 1. p. 786 b.) Non sit nobis religio cultus hominum mortuorum: quia si pie vixerunt, non sic habentur, ut tales quærant honores: sed illum a nobis coli volunt, quo illuminante lætantur, meriti sui nos esse consortes. Honorandi ergo sunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.

therefore to be honoured for their imitable and worthy examples, not to be worshipped for religion.' So again in answer to the calumny of the Manichees, who made no conscience of falsely accusing the Catholics of giving them divine honour and adoration, he says[75], 'We celebrate the memories of the martyrs with religious solemnity, to excite ourselves to their imitation, and to become partners in their merits, and to have the benefit of their prayers: yet so, as that we never offer any sacrifice to a martyr, but only to the God of the martyrs. For what priest, standing at the altar in the places where the holy bodies lie, ever said, We offer unto thee, Peter, or Paul, or Cyprian? But whatever is offered, is offered unto God that crowned the martyrs at the memorials or graves of those whom he crowned, that the very places may admonish us of our duty, and raise our affection, and quicken our love both toward them whom we may imitate, and toward him who enables us to imitate them.'

Imitation, we see, was the great thing designed by these festivals, and all the eloquent discourses that were made upon the martyrs: they were not so much intended to be panegyrics and praises of the martyrs, who were above them and needed them not, as to be flaming and warm engagements upon the audience, to induce them to imitate the glorious actions and virtues of the martyrs. Thus Chrysostom expressly tells his auditory, beginning one of these Panegyrics[76] with these

[75] Cont. Faust. l. 20. c. 21. (t. 8. p. 347 b.) Populus autem Christianus memorias martyrum religiosa solemnitate concelebrat, et ad excitandam imitationem, et ut meritis eorum consocietur, atque orationibus adjuvetur: ita tamen, ut nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum, quamvis in memoriis martyrum, constituamus altaria. Quis enim antistitum, in locis sanctorum corporum assistens altari, aliquando dixit, *Offerimus tibi, Petre, aut Paule, aut Cypriane?* sed, quod offertur, offertur Deo, qui martyres coronavit, apud memorias eorum quos coronavit: ut ex ipsorum locorum admonitione major affectus exsurgat ad acuendam caritatem, et in illos quos imitari possumus, et in illum quo adjuvante possumus.

[76] Hom. 73. de Barlaam Mart. t. 1. p. 886. (t. 2. p. 681 a.) *Συνεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν ταύτην ἑορτὴν καὶ πανήγυριν ὁ Μακάριος Βαρλαάμ· οὐχ ἵνα αὐτὸν ἐπαινέσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτὸν ζηλώσωμεν· οὐχ ἵνα ἀκροαταὶ γενώμεθα τῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἀλλ' ἵνα μιμηταὶ γενώμεθα τῶν αὐτοῦ κατορθωμάτων . . . . . Τότε γὰρ μάλιστα τῆς οἰκείας τιμῆς αἴσθησιν λαμβάνουσιν οἱ μάρτυρες, ὅταν τοὺς συνδούλους τοὺς ἑαυτῶν πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἰδίων ἀγαθῶν κοινωνίαν φθάσαντας ἴδωσιν. Ὥστε εἴ τις βούλεται ἐπαινεῖν μάτυρας, μιμείσθω μάρτυρας· εἴ τις βούλεται ἐγκωμιάζειν τοὺς ἀθλητὰς τῆς εὐσεβείας, ζηλούτω τὸν ἐκείνων πόνον· τοῦτο τοῖς μάρτυσιν οὐκ ἐλάττω τῶν οἰκείων κατορθωμάτων οἴσει τὴν ἡδονήν.*

words: 'Blessed Barlaam hath called us together to this holy festival with great solemnity, not to praise him, but to imitate him; not to be hearers of his encomium, but to be followers of his worthy actions. For then the martyrs are chiefly sensible of honour done to themselves, when they see their fellow-servants made partakers of their own goodness. Therefore if any one would praise the martyrs, let him imitate the martyrs: if any one would give the champions of religion their just encomium, let him emulate their labours. This will bring no less pleasure to the martyrs than their own virtues.' And he closes the same discourse with this exhortation[79]: 'Thou art a soldier of Christ, beloved; put on thy armour and mind not thy dress: thou art a generous combatant; quit thyself like a man, and regard not external comeliness. So shall we imitate these holy men: so shall we honour these valiant warriors, these crowned champions, these friends of God.' It were easy to cite hundreds of passages out of Chrysostom and other ancient writers to the same purpose. For this was the great drift of all their panegyrics and discourses upon these festivals, to assure men that to copy after the example of the martyrs was the greatest honour they could show to these renowned champions of the Christian faith. And it always had its proper effects upon men's minds. For, as in times of persecution, Tertullian[77] told the Heathen, 'that the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church; and the more they were cut down, the more they grew; the exquisite cruelty that was used to destroy them did only allure greater numbers to come over to their party:' so Chrysostom afterwards[78] assures us, 'that the

[76] Ibid. (p. 687 d.) *Στρατιώτης εἶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπητέ· ὁπλίζου, μὴ καλλωπίζου· ἀθλητὴς εἶ γενναῖος· ἀνδρίζου, μὴ ὡραΐζου· οὕτω μιμησώμεθα τοὺς ἁγίους τούτους· οὕτω τιμήσωμεν τοὺς ἀριστέας· τοὺς στεφανίτας, τοὺς Θεοῦ φίλους· καὶ βαδίσαντες τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ὁδὸν τῶν αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς στεφάνων ἐπιτευξόμεθα.*

[77] Apol. c. 50. (p. 40 b.) .... Nec quicquam tamen proficit exquisitior quæque crudelitas vestra: illecebra est magis sectæ: plures efficimur, quoties metimur a vobis; semen est sanguis Christianorum. — Ad Scapul. c. 5. (p. 72.) .... Hanc sectam tunc magis ædificari scias, cum cædi videtur.

[78] Hom. 20. t. 5. p. 290. [In Dict. Paul. *Nolo vos ignorare, &c.*] (t. 3. p. 229 b.) *Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως οἱ λιμένες πλωτῆρας, ὡς αἱ τῶν ἁγίων τούτων ἑορταὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς ἀνακτᾶσθαι πεφύκασιν· ἐκείνους μὲν γὰρ θαλαττίων κυμάτων ἐμβολῆς, καὶ ἐρεσίας μακρᾶς ἀπαλλάττουσι λιμένες· τοὺς δὲ εἰς πανήγυριν μαρτύρων ἀπαντῶντας, πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων, λογισμῶν ἀτόπων, πολλῆς τῆς ἐν ψυχῇ γινομένης ζάλης, ἡ τῶν ἁγίων μνήμη τούτων ἐξαρπάζειν εἴωθε.*

very memory of the martyrs wrought wonderful effects upon the minds of men: it confirmed them against the assaults of wicked spirits, it delivered them from impure and absurd thoughts, and set their minds in great tranquillity.' 'The death of the martyrs was still an exhortation to Christians[79], the support of the Church, the confirmation of Christianity, the destruction of death, the demonstration of the resurrection, the reproach of devils, the condemnation of Satan, the doctrine of philosophy, an exhortation to despise the things of this world, and the way to lead men to the desire of a better, a comfort to men in affliction, a motive to patience, an engagement to fortitude, and, in a word, the root and fountain and mother of all that is good.' 'When you see the martyrs despise life[80], though you be the most stupid and negligent of all creatures, you cannot but entertain sublime and exalted thoughts, contemning pleasures, despising riches, and desiring to have your conversation in heaven. If you languish under a disease, the passions of the martyrs will afford you one of the strongest arguments to engage you to patience; if you are oppressed with poverty, or any other evils, cast but your eye to the bitterness of the torments which they endured, and you have a present consolation and remedy for all the troubles that can befall you. For this reason I love above all things the com-

[79] Hom. 67. de S. Drosid. t. 5. p. 991. (t. 2. p. 690 b.) *Μαρτύρων γὰρ θάνατος πιστῶν ἐστι παράκλησις, ἐκκλησιῶν παρρησία, Χριστιανισμοῦ σύστασις, θανάτου κατάλυσις, ἀναστάσεως ἀπόδειξις, δαιμόνων γέλως, Διαβόλου κατηγορία, φιλοσοφίας διδασκαλία, παραίνεσις τῆς ὑπεροψίας τῶν παρόντων πραγμάτων, καὶ τῆς τῶν μελλόντων ἐπιθυμίας ὁδὸς, παραμυθία τῶν κατεχόντων ἡμᾶς δεινῶν, καὶ ὑπομονῆς πρόφασις, καρτερίας ἀφορμὴ, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν ῥίζα, καὶ πηγὴ, καὶ μήτηρ.*

[80] Ibid. p. 994. (p. 692 c.) *Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδῃς τούτους ἁπάσης καταφρονοῦντας τῆς ζωῆς, κἂν ἁπάντων ἀναισθητότερος ᾖς καὶ νωθρότατος, ὑψηλότατον δέξῃ φρόνημα, καὶ καταγελάσῃ τρυφῆς, ὑπερόψει χρημάτων, καὶ ἐπιθυμήσεις τῆς ἐκεῖ διατριβῆς· κἂν ἐν ἀρρωστίαις ᾖς, εἰς ὑπομονὴν ἀφορμὴν λήψῃ μεγίστην, τὰ τῶν μαρτύρων παθήματα· κἂν πενίᾳ πιέζῃ, κἂν ὁτιοῦν ἕτερον τῶν χαλεπωτάτων, πρὸς τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐκείνοις ἐπαχθεισῶν βασάνων βλέπων ἀρκοῦσαν ἕξεις παραμυθίαν τῶν κατειληφότων ἁπάντων δεινῶν. Διὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα φιλῶ τῶν μαρτύρων τὰς μνήμας, καὶ φιλῶ καὶ ἀσπάζομαι πάσας μὲν, μάλιστα δὲ ὅταν γυναῖκες ἀγωνιζόμεναι τύχωσιν· ὅσῳ γὰρ τὸ σκεῦος ἀσθενέστερον, τοσούτῳ μείζων ἡ χάρις, τοσούτῳ λαμπρότερον τὸ τρόπαιον, τοσούτῳ περιφανεστέρα ἡ νίκη, οὐ διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς φύσεως τῶν ἀθλητῶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ οἷς ἐκράτησεν ὁ ἐχθρὸς, τούτοις ἑάλω νῦν. Διὰ παρθένου γοῦν ἀπέκτεινε πρώην τὸν Ἀδὰμ ὁ Διάβολος· διὰ παρθένου μετὰ ταῦτα κατηγωνίσατο τὸν Διάβολον ὁ Χριστός· καὶ τὸ ξίφος, ὅπερ ἦν ἠκονημένον αὐτῷ καθ' ἡμῶν, τοῦτο τὴν τοῦ δράκοντος ἀπέτεμε κεφαλήν.*

memorations of the martyrs. I love and embrace them all, but especially those wherein we commemorate the martyrdom of women (such as Drosis, about whom he was now speaking): because by how much they are the weaker vessel, by so much greater is their grace, their trophy more illustrious, their victory more glorious, not only for the weakness of their sex, but because the enemy of human nature is overcome by that by which it was first vanquished. For by a virgin the Devil first slew Adam, and by a virgin afterwards Christ overcame the Devil; and that very sword which was sharpened against us cut off the head of the dragon.' He often repeats[81] this famous aphorism, 'that the honour of the martyrs is to imitate their fortitude and virtue;' and as frequently inculcates[82] Tertullian's observation, 'that the blood of the martyrs waters the beautiful plants of the Church. For as plants grow the more for being watered, so the faith flourishes the more for being opposed[83], and the more it is persecuted the more it grows: nor does water make a garden more fertile than the blood of the martyrs does the Church.' For this reason the Ancients strained all their eloquence to set off the constancy and gallantry of the martyrs on their proper festivals, that hereby they might induce their hearers to copy after such great and brave examples.

The communion always administered upon these days.

7. And because, as Chrysostom[84] observes, 'the blood of Christ, which he first shed for the martyrs themselves, was the great thing that animated so many thousands to lay down their lives with joy and alacrity for his sake, that they might communicate in his sufferings, and be made conformable to his

[81] Hom. 47. in Julian. Mart. t. 1. p. 611. (ibid. p. 677 c.) Τιμὴ γὰρ μαρτύρων οὐ τὸ παραγενέσθαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τούτου τὸ ζηλῶσαι τὴν ἀνδρείαν αὐτῶν.— [Cf. Hom. 72. de Martyr. Omnib. t. 1. p. 696. Ed. Francofurt. 1697. (ibid. p. 667 c.) .... Τιμὴ μάρτυρος, μίμησις μάρτυρος. *Grischov.*]

[82] Hom. 74. de Martyr. t. 1. p. 898. (ibid. p. 714 a.) .... Αἷμα διηνεκῶς τὰ καλὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἄρδον φυτά.

[83] Hom. 40. in Juvent. et Max. t. 1. p. 547. (ibid. p. 579 d.) Καθάπερ γὰρ τὰ φυτὰ ἀρδευόμενα αὔξεσθαι πέφυκεν· οὕτω καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡμετέρα πολεμουμένη μᾶλλον ἀνθεῖ, καὶ ἐνοχλουμένη πλεονάζει, καὶ οὐχ οὕτω τοὺς κήπους εὐθαλεῖς ἡ τῶν ὑδάτων ἀρδεία ποιεῖν εἴωθεν, ὡς τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῶν μαρτύρων τὸ αἷμα ποτίζειν πέφυκε.

[84] Hom. 74. de Martyr. t. 1. p. 899. (ibid. p. 714 a.) Δι' ἐκεῖνο τὸ αἷμα τοῦτο ἔρρευσεν· ἐξ οὗ γὰρ ἐνύγη ἡ πλευρὰ τοῦ Δεσπότου, μυρίας ὁρᾷς λοιπὸν πλευρὰς νυττομένας· τίς γὰρ οὐ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἀποδύσαιτο πολλῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἀγῶνας τούτους, μέλλων κοινωνεῖν Δεσποτικῶν παθημάτων, καὶ συμμορφοῦσθαι τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

death :' therefore these festivals of the martyrs never passed without a general communion of the whole Church partaking of the blessed symbols of Christ's body and blood, the oblation of which was always celebrated upon these occasions. This we learn from the same St. Chrysostom [85], who, dissuading his people from intemperance upon one of these solemnities, bids them consider 'how absurd it was after such a meeting, after a whole night's vigil, after hearing the holy Scriptures, after participating of the divine mysteries, after such a spiritual repast, for a man or woman to be found spending whole days in a tavern.' The foundation of his argument is laid upon this supposition, that they had received the eucharist in the church before, in celebrating the memorial of the martyrs. And so Sidonius Apollinaris represents the matter, when [86], speaking of the festival of St. Justus, one of their proper martyrs at Lyons, he says, 'that after they had kept his vigil the night preceding, they assembled again by day at nine in the morning, when the priests did *rem divinam facere,' offer the oblation* or *consecrate the eucharist,* as Savaro [87] rightly expounds it.

8. And at this time particularly they made a more solemn commemoration of the martyrs in the oblation of the eucharist; which being a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God for the example of their noble courage and sufferings on the behalf of religion, it was therefore commonly styled *the oblation or sacrifice made for the nativities of the martyrs.* Thus we find it in Tertullian [88], 'We make oblations for the dead, for their birthdays, or new birth into heaven and happiness, on their anniversary commemorations.' In like manner, Cyprian [89] bids his clergy 'register the days on which any of the confessors suffered death, that commemoration might be made

And herein a particular commemoration of the martyrs was made, called *the oblation* or *sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God for them*, and prayer for a general consumma-

[85] Hom. 59. de Martyr. t. 5. p. 779. (ibid. p. 669 a.) Ἐννόησον ἡλίκος γέλως, μετὰ τοιαύτην σύνοδον, μετὰ παννυχίδας, μετὰ Γραφῶν ἁγίων ἀκρόασιν, μετὰ μυστηρίων θείων κοινωνίαν, καὶ μετὰ πνευματικὴν χορηγίαν, ἄνδρα ἢ γυναῖκα ἐν καπηλείῳ φαίνεσθαι διημερεύοντας.

[86] L. 5. Ep. 17. See s. 9. n. 94, following.

[87] [In loc. (p. 364.) *Res Divina facienda.* Id est missarum solemnia celebranda, missa facienda, sacrificia offerenda, ut ipse [Sidonius] loquitur Ep. 15. l. 4. Ed.]

[88] De Cor. Mil. 3. See before, s. 2. p. 340. n. 49.

[89] Ep. 37. [al. 12.] p. 27. (p. 188.) Denique et dies eorum, quibus excedunt annotate, ut commemorationes eorum inter memorias martyrum celebrare possimus.... Et celebrentur hic a nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemorationes eorum.

ion and appy esurrec-ion.

of them among the memorials of the martyrs, and that oblations and sacrifices might be made for them on the solemn days of their commemoration.' So again in another Epistle[90], 'Ye remember how we are used to offer sacrifices for them, as often as we celebrate the passions and days of the martyrs by an anniversary commemoration.'

There is some little dispute indeed among some of the Ancients, what was to be understood by these 'sacrifices or oblations for the martyrs.' St. Austin was of opinion that they could only mean the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to God for their glorious deaths and brave examples. And this no doubt was one part of the sacrifice they speak of: but when he says[91], 'that he, who prays for a martyr, does an injury to the martyr, because martyrs have attained to a sort of perfection in this life, and have no need of the prayers of the Church;' this is not so consistent with the general practice of the Church, which was used to pray for patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, as considering them in a state of imperfection still, so long as their bodies continued in the grave: which the Apostle himself allows, when he says, "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect:" [Heb. 11, 40.] therefore the Church may be supposed by her sacrifices and oblations for martyrs to understand *prayers* as well as *praises and thanksgivings*, that they and all the faithful might obtain a perfect consummation in bliss by the means of an happy resurrection. And that the Church did sometimes thus offer the sacrifice of prayer even for martyrs themselves, I have fully evinced in a former Book[92], and therefore need say no more of it in this place.

[90] Ep. 34. [al. 39.] p. 77. (p. 224.) Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus, quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus.

[91] Serm. 17. de Verb. Apost. t. 10. p. 132. [al. Serm. 159.] (t. 5. p. 765 f.) In patria vero nullus orandi locus erit, sed tantum laudandi. Quare orandi nullus locus erit? Quia nihil deest. Quod hic creditur, ibi videtur: quod hic speratur, ibi teneatur; quod hic petitur, ibi accipitur. Perfectio tamen in hac vita nonnulla est, ad quam sancti martyres pervenerunt. Ideoque habet ecclesiastica disciplina, quod fideles noverunt, cum martyres eo loco recitantur ad altare Dei, ubi non pro ipsis oretur; pro cæteris autem commemoratis defunctis oratur. Injuria est enim, pro martyre orare, cujus nos debemus orationibus commendari. Certavit enim contra peccatum usque ad sanguinem.

[92] B. 15. ch. 3. s. 16. v. 5. pp. 309, seqq.

9. But we must observe, that for the solemnizing of these festivals of the martyrs, they commonly kept a vigil the night preceding, which they spent, as they did those before the Lord's-day and other great festivals, in psalmody, hymns, and prayers, till the morning light. This is plain from Chrysostom's exhortation to the people upon one of these festivals[93]: 'Ye have turned the night into day, διὰ τῶν παννυχίδων τῶν ἱερῶν, *by keeping your holy station all the night:* do not now turn the day into night again by drunkenness and intemperance, and wanton and lascivious songs.' In like manner Sidonius Apollinaris[94] describing the manner of their solemnizing the festival of St. Justus, bishop of Lyons, takes notice not only of the observation of the day, but of the preceding vigil. 'We met,' says he, 'at the grave of St. Justus; it was a morning procession before day; it was an anniversary solemnity; the confluence of people of both sexes was so great, that the church, though very capacious and surrounded with cloisters, would not contain them. When the service of the vigil was ended, which the monks and clerical singers performed with alternate melody, we separated for some time, but went not far away, as being to meet again at three o'clock, (that is, nine in the morning,) when the priests were to perform divine service, (that is, the service of the communion,) as on a festival.' Thus the festivals of the martyrs were always introduced with a vigil, according to the manner of the Lord's-day.

The night preceding any of these festivals commonly observed as a vigil, with psalmody and prayers.

10. It was usual also upon these days for the rich to make feasts of charity, or common entertainments for the use of the poor at the graves of the martyrs. Some learned men[95] think

Common entertainments made by the rich

[93] Hom. 59. de Martyr. t. 5. p. 779. (t. 2. p. 668 d.) Ἐποιήσατε τὴν νυκτα ἡμέραν διὰ τῶν παννυχίδων τῶν ἱερῶν· μὴ ποιήσατε πάλιν τὴν ἡμέραν νυκτα διὰ τῆς μέθης, καὶ τῆς κραιπάλης, καὶ τῶν ἀσμάτων τῶν πορνικῶν.

[94] L. 5. Ep. 17. (p. 361.) Conveneramus ad sancti sepulchrum: processio fuerat antelucana, solemnitas anniversaria, populus ingens sexu ex utroque, quem capacissima basilica non caperet, et quamlibet cincta diffusis cryptoporticibus. Cultu peracto vigiliarum, quas alternante mulcedine monachi clericique psalmicines concelebraverant, quisque in diversa secessimus, non procul tamen, utpote ad tertiam præsto futuri, cum sacerdotibus res divina facienda.

[95] Cave, Primitive Christianity, part 1. ch. 7. p. 204. (p. 98.) They heard sermons and orations, joined in public prayers and praises, received the holy sacrament, offered gifts and charities for the poor, recited the names of the martyrs, then commemorated with their due eulogies and commendations, and their virtues propounded to the imitation of the hearers. For which purpose they had their set notaries, who took the acts, sayings, and sufferings of martyrs, which were after compiled

for the use of the poor, upon these festivals at the graves of the martyrs, till abuses causedthem to be laid aside.

this may be one meaning of those sacrifices and oblations which are said to be made at the monuments of the martyrs; and others[96] there are who think this was the only meaning of them; because the word *natalitia*, in propriety, signifies *the donations* or *largesses, which men were used to make upon their birthdays*, rather than the birthdays themselves. But not to dispute this matter by way of criticism with any, it is certain they had their *συμπόσια*, or *feasts of charity*, and common banquets on these days at the graves of the martyrs. The ancient writer under the name of Origen[97] says, 'on these solemnities they met together, both clergy and people, inviting the poor and needy, and refreshing the widows and the orphans; that so their festival might not only be a memorial of the happy state of the deceased, but in respect of themselves also an odour of a sweet smell in the sight of God.' In like manner Constantine[98] says, 'sober feasts were made by many for the relief of the poor, and such as stood in need of their assistance.' So Chrysostom[99], dissuading his people

into particular treatises, and were recited in these annual meetings; and this was the first original of Martyrologies in the Christian Church..... Tertullian often: 'Upon an anniversary-day,' says he, 'we make oblations for them that are departed in memory of their *natalitia* or *birthdays*:' and to the same purpose elsewhere. 'As oft,' says Cyprian, 'as by an anniversary commemoration we celebrate the passion-days of the martyrs, we always offer sacrifices for them:' and the same phrases oft occur in many other of the Fathers. By which it is evident they meant no more than their public prayers, and offering up praises to God for their piety, and constancy, and the excellent examples of their martyrs, their celebrating the eucharist at these times. as the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, their oblation of alms and charity for the poor, every one of which truly may, and often is, styled a sacrifice or oblation; and are so understood by some of the more moderate even of the Romish Church.

[96] Hospinian, de Fest. Christian. c. 3. p. 10. (pp. 13, seqq.) De Memoriis Martyrum. See especially (p. 18. col. sinistr.) Quæritur autem hoc loco, &c.—Junius, Not. in Tertul. de Cor. Mil. c. 3. (Oper. Tertul. Franequer. 1597. Notarum, p. 126.) *Oblationes pro defunctis*.... Hæc igitur legata sunt testamentaria: quemadmodum et oblationes pro natalitiis dicuntur institutiones a viventibus facta in diem natalem ipsorum, ut pauperibus egentibusque aliquid daretur refrigerii, &c.

[97] In Job. p. 437. (t. 2. p. 902 a.) Celebramus nimirum religiosos cum sacerdotibus convocantes, fideles una cum clero, invitantes adhuc egenos et pauperes, pupillos et viduas saturantes, ut fiat festivitas nostra in memoriam requiei defunctis animabus, quarum memoriam celebramus, nobis autem efficiatur in odorem suavitatis in conspectu æterni Dei.

[98] Orat. ad Sanctos, c. 12. (ad calc. Euseb. H. E. Cantabr. 1720. p. 692. 23.) *Σωφρονέστατα δὲ πολλῶν καὶ τὰ συμπόσια, πρὸς ἔλεον καὶ ἀνάκτησιν τῶν δεομένων ποιούμενα, καὶ πρὸς βοήθειαν τῶν ἐκπεσόντων.*

[99] Hom. 47. in Sanct. Julian. t. 1. p. 613. (t. 2. p. 678 c.) *Εἰ δὲ βού-*

from running to the diabolical entertainments that were used to be made at Daphne, one of the suburbs of Antioch, tells them, 'that if they desired a corporeal as well as a spiritual table upon any of these festivals, they might, as soon as the assembly was done, recreate and feast their bodies under a vine or fig-tree near the monument of the martyr, and thereby secure their conscience from condemnation. For the very sight of the martyr being near them, and as it were standing by their table, would not suffer their pleasure to run out into excess and degenerate into sin; but as a good father or a master, being looked upon with the eye of faith, would restrain all ridiculous mirth, and cut off all indecent pleasures, and take away all lascivious motions of the flesh, which could not be avoided, if they went to the vain pomps of Daphne, where the Devil reigned in the midst of them.'

It appears from this that these feasts were then managed with great sobriety and gravity, and chiefly used, as they were originally designed, for the use and benefit of the poor. And as such, they are recommended by Nazianzen[1], Theodoret[2],

λει [βούλῃ, Savil.] καὶ νῦν τέρψεως ἀπολαῦσαι, τί τερπνότερον τοῦ συλλόγου τούτου; τί χαριέστερον τοῦ θεάτρου τοῦ πνευματικοῦ; τῶν μελῶν τῶν σῶν; τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν συνουσίας; Ἀλλὰ καὶ σωματικῆς θέλεις τραπέζης μετασχεῖν; ἐνταῦθα ἔξεστι μετὰ τὸ λυθῆναι τὸν σύλλογον, τοῦ μαρτυρίου πλησίον ὑπὸ συκὴν ἢ ἄμπελον καταλύσαντι, καὶ τῷ σώματι χαρίσασθαι τὴν ἄνεσιν, καὶ τὸ συνειδὸς ἀπαλλάξαι καταγνώσεως. Ὁ γὰρ μάρτυς ἐγγύθεν ὁρώμενος καὶ πλησίον ὢν καὶ παρεστηκὼς αὐτῇ τῇ τραπέζῃ, οὐκ ἀφίησι τὴν ἡδονὴν εἰς ἁμαρτίαν ἐκχυθῆναι. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τις παιδαγωγὸς, ἢ πατὴρ ἄριστος τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὁρώμενος ὀφθαλμοῖς καταστέλλει τὸν γέλωτα· περικόπτει τὰς ἡδονὰς τὰς ἀτόπους· τὰ σκιρτήματα τῆς σαρκὸς ἅπαντα ἀναιρεῖ, ἅπερ ἐκεῖ οὐκ ἔστι διαφυγεῖν. Τίνος ἕνεκεν; ὅτι χοροὶ ἀνδρῶν αὔριον τὸ προάστειον καταλαμβάνουσιν· ἡ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων ὄψις καὶ τὸν βουλόμενον σωφρονεῖν ἄκοντα ὑπεξάγει πολλάκις πρὸς τὴν τῆς αὐτῆς ἀσχημοσύνης μίμησιν· καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν καὶ ὁ Διάβολος μέσος ἐκείνοις παρῇ· καὶ γὰρ πάρεστιν ὑπὸ τῶν πορνικῶν ἀσμάτων, ὑπὸ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ῥημάτων, ὑπὸ τῆς δαιμονικῆς πομπῆς καλούμενος.

[1] Carm. 10. de Diversis Vitæ Generibus. (t. 2. p. 80 d.)

Οὐδ' ἱερὴν ἐπὶ δαῖτα γενέθλιον ἠὲ θανόντος,
Ἢ τινα νυμφιδίην σὺν πλεόνεσσι θέων.

[2] Therapeut. Serm. 8. [al. Græcor. Affect. Curat. l. 8.] (t. 4. part. 2. p. 920.) Οὗτοι πάντες, ζῶντες μὲν ἦσαν περίβλεπτοι, καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐνίκων, καὶ μετὰ τὰς νίκας πομπὰς ἐπετέλουν καὶ ἑορτάς· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐτελεύτησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν πολλῶν διαφέρουσιν. Οὔτε γὰρ τάφους ἔχουσιν ἐπισήμους, οὔτε δημοθοινίαις ἐτησίοις γεραίρονται.—It. (p. 923.) Ἀντὶ τῶν Πανδίων, καὶ Διασίων, καὶ Διονυσίων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὑμῶν ἑορτῶν, Πέτρου, καὶ Παύλου, καὶ Θωμᾶ, καὶ Σεργίου, καὶ Μαρκέλλου, καὶ Λεοντίου, καὶ Παντελεήμονος, καὶ Ἀντωνίνου, καὶ Μαυρικίου, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μαρτύρων, ἐπιτελοῦνται δημοθοινίαι· καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς πάλαι πομπείας, καὶ αἰσχρουργίας, καὶ

Paulinus[3], and others, being indeed nothing more than those common feasts of charity, called *agapæ*, and derived from apostolical practice, only now applied to the festivals of the martyrs. But as the best things by the corruptions of men often degenerate into abuses, so it fared with this laudable practice. Some made use of it only as an opportunity of gratifying their covetousness and desires of filthy lucre; others hence took occasion to indulge themselves in revellings and dancings; and some were so vain as to think that even rioting and drunkenness at such times was for the honour of the martyr. The last of these abuses was so notorious, that the Manichees hence took occasion to rail at the Church, and calumniate her as encouraging such abominable practices in her people: which though it was a malicious slander in respect of the Church, who did all she could to discourage such excesses; yet in respect of the people, the fact was too true, and the charge too well-grounded to be denied of them all in general. Therefore St. Austin[4], in answer to the objection, is forced to own the charge in part as true. 'I know,' says he, 'there are many who superstitiously worship graves and pictures. I know many that drink luxuriously and excessively over the dead, and, when they make a feast for the deceased, bury themselves over those that lie buried in the graves, and after all place their gluttony and drunkenness to the account of religion. But I advise you to leave off railing at the Catholic Church for this: for in speaking against the morals of such men, you only condemn those whom the Church herself condemns, and daily labours to correct them as wicked children.' 'They who make themselves drunk in the memorials of the martyrs,' says he again in another place[5] in answer to

αἰσχρορρημοσύνης, σώφρονες ἑορτάζονται πανηγύρεις, οὐ μέθην ἔχουσαι, καὶ κῶμον, καὶ γέλωτα, ἀλλ' ὕμνους θείους, καὶ ἱερῶν λογίων ἀκρόασιν, καὶ προσευχὴν ἀξιεπαίνοις κοσμουμένην δακρύοις

[3] Natal. S. Felic. 6. (p. 561.)

Concordate meis, precor, et complaudite, fratres,
Carminibus, castoque animos effundite luxu:
Gaudia sancta decent et carmina casta fideles.

[4] De Morib. Eccles. Cathol. c. 34. t. 1. p. 331. (t. 1. p. 713 e.) Novi multos esse sepulchrorum, et picturarum adoratores: novi multos esse, qui luxuriosissime super mortuos bibant, et, epulas cadaveribus exhibentes, super sepultos seipsos sepeliant, et voracitates ebrietatesque suas deputent religioni.

[5] Cont. Faust. l. 20. c. 21. (t. 8. p. 348 a.) Qui autem se in memoriis martyrum inebriant, quomodo a no-

the same objection, 'are so far from having the approbation of the Church, that she condemns them for being guilty of that vice in their own private houses. It is one thing that we are commanded to teach, and another thing that we are commanded to correct, and forced to tolerate and endure, till we can amend it.' St. Ambrose[6] happily corrected this intemperance at Milan, by prohibiting all such feasts in the church: and St. Austin[7] made use of his example to persuade Aurelius, the primate of Carthage, to use his authority to do the same in the African Churches. Upon which Aurelius got a canon made in the third Council of Carthage[8], obliging the clergy to refrain from all such feasting in the church, and as much as in them lay, to restrain the people from the same practice. This had been prohibited before by the Council of Laodicea[9], forbidding all feasts of charity, and all eating and spreading of tables in the church: and it was prohibited afterwards by the second Council of Orleans in France, where a general canon[10] was made, 'that no one should pretend to pay any vow in the church by singing, or drinking, or any loose behaviour what-

bis approbari possunt, cum eos, etiam si in domibus suis id faciant, sana doctrina condemnet? Sed ailud est quod docemus, aliud quod sustinemus, aliud quod emendare præcipimur, et donec emendemus tolerare compellimur.—Conf. Ambros. de Elia et Jejunio, c. 17. (t. 1. p. 554 c. n. 62.) Quid obtestationes potentium loquor?.... Bibamus, inquiunt, pro salute imperatoris [al. Opto salutem imperatorum] et qui non biberit, sit [al. fiat] reus indevotionis.... Hæc vota ad Deum pervenire judicant, sicut illi, qui calices ad sepulchra martyrum deferunt, atque illic in vesperam bibunt, et aliter se exaudiri posse non credunt. O stultitiam hominum, qui ebrietatem sacrificium putant: qui existimant illos ebrietate placari, qui jejunio passiones sustinere didicerunt [al. qui æstiment illis ebrietatem placere, qui jejunio passionem sustinere didicerunt].—Cyprian. de Duplici Martyrio, p. 42. (int. Spuria, p. 183.) Annon videmus ad martyrum memorias, &c.

[6] Vid. Augustin. Confes. l. 6. c. 2. (t. 1. p. 120 b.) Itaque ubi comperit a præclaro prædicatore atque antistite pietatis præceptum esse, ista non fieri, &c.

[7] Ep. 64. [al. 22.] ad Aurelian. (t. 2. p. 27.) Consult the whole and especially sect. 4. (p. 28.) Hæc si prima Africa tentaret auferre a cæteris terris imitatione digna esse deberet. Cum vero et per Italiæ maximam partem ac prope omnibus transmarinis ecclesiis.... episcoporum diligentia et animadversione extincta atque deleta sunt, &c.

[8] C. 30. (t. 2. p. 1171 d.) Ut nulli episcopi vel clerici in ecclesia conviventur, nisi forte transeuntes hospitiorum necessitate illic reficiantur. Populi etiam ab hujusmodi conviviis, quantum fieri potest, prohibeantur.

[9] C. 28. (t. 1. p. 1501 c.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν τοῖς κυριακοῖς, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, τὰς λεγομένας ἀγάπας ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐσθίειν καὶ ἀκούβιτα στρωννύειν.

[10] C. 12. (t. 4. p. 1781 e.) Ne quis in ecclesia votum suum cantando, bibendo, vel lasciviendo exsolvat [al. dissolvat], quia Deus talibus votis irritatur potius quam placetur.

soever: because God was rather provoked than appeased by such vows as these.'

There was another evil custom prevailing in France in the time of king Clodoveus II. about the year 650, when the first Council of Chalons was held, which endeavoured by a canon [11] to correct it, viz. 'that on the festivals of martyrs and dedications of churches, companies of women were used to come before the church, singing filthy and obscene songs, whilst they should have been at divine service: whom they therefore order to be repelled, and if they persisted obstinate in their wickedness, to be prosecuted with the severest censures of the Church.'

St. Basil [12] mentions another abuse of these festivals, which was men's keeping markets at these times and places, under colour of making better provision for these feasts: but he smartly rebukes this as 'a great encroachment upon piety, wholly unbecoming such solemnities, which were designed purely for prayer and the commemoration of the virtues of holy men, for our encouragement and imitation; and he tells such men they ought to remember the severity of our Saviour, who whipped the buyers and sellers out of the temple, when by their marketings and merchandise they had turned the house of prayer into a den of thieves.'

There are many other abuses and corruptions, which crept into the Church at this door in after-ages, such as the invocation of saints and martyrs, the worshipping of relics, pilgrimages and visitings of shrines, and the like superstitious prac-

[11] C. 19. (t. 6. p. 391 b.) Noscitur valde esse indecorum, quod per dedicationes basilicarum, vel festivitates martyrum, ad ipsa solemnia confluentes chorus fœmineus turpia quidem et obscœna cantica decantare videntur, dum aut orare debeant, aut clericos psallentes audire. Unde convenit, ut sacerdotes loci talia a septis basilicarum, vel porticibus ipsarum, ac etiam ab ipsis atriis, vetare debeant et arcere. Et si voluntarie noluerint emendare, aut excommunicari debeant, aut disciplinæ aculeum sustinere.

[12] Regul. Major. quæst. 40. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 450 e.) *Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὰς ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις γινομένας ἀγορασίας οἰκείας ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος δείκνυσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλου τινὸς ἕνεκεν ἐν τοῖς μαρτυρίοις, ἢ ἐν τοῖς περὶ αὐτὰ τόποις φαίνεσθαι ἐπιβάλλει Χριστιανοῖς, ἢ προσευχῆς ἕνεκεν, καὶ τοῦ εἰς ὑπόμνησιν ἐλθόντας τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας μέχρι θανάτου ἐνστάσεως πρὸς τὸν ζῆλον τὸν ὅμοιον προτραπῆναι, μεμνημένους τῆς φοβερωτάτης ὀργῆς τοῦ Κυρίου, ὅτι καὶ πάντοτε, καὶ πανταχοῦ πραὺς ὤν, καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καθὼς γέγραπται, μόνοις τοῖς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πωλοῦσι καὶ ἀγοράζουσι τὴν μάστιγα ἐπανετείνετο, ὡς τῆς ἐμπορίας τὸν οἶκον τῆς προσευχῆς μεταποιούσης εἰς σπήλαιον λῃστῶν.*

tices, which, as they were utterly unknown or disallowed in the purer ages of the Church, so it is none of my business here further to pursue.

What festivals observed in memory of the Apostles.

11. But it may be inquired, whether any particular days were set apart in memory of the Apostles and first disciples of Christ? To which I answer, that as many of them as were martyrs, and the time and place of their passions was known, there is no reason to question, but that they had anniversary commemorations among the rest of the martyrs, at least from the time that the festivals of martyrs began to be observed in the Church. Thus the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul was observed at Rome, either upon the 29th of June or the 22nd of February: for the day is disputed between bishop Pearson[13] and Pagi[14], and I will not pretend to decide the

[13] Annal. Cyprian. an. 258. p. 63. (ap. Oper. Cyprian. Ed. Amstel. 1700. p. 50.) Hujus observationis utilitas diem respicit, quo facta esse dicitur translatio, nempe tertium Kalendas Julii; quo die vulgo putant eos Apostolos passos esse, contra veterum sententiam, qui ultimo Neronis anno eorum martyrium ascribunt. Ultimo enim Neronis anno, vicesimo nono Junii, pati non potuere, quia ipse Nero sexto die Junii periit. Sed si alio die depositio facta est, alio translatio, quam secuta est postea solemnitas, salva erit veterum sententia. Et sane ante Pseudo-Isidori ætatem, ante Gesta Pontificalia, natalibus SS. Apostolorum Petri et Pauli alius dies assignabatur. Nam Polemius Sylvius in Laterculo suo, sacra profanaque festa continente, A. D. CCCCXLIX. evulgato, hæc habet: *viii. Cal.* (Martii) *depositio SS. Petri et Pauli.* De qua varietate alibi latius a nobis disputatum est.

[14] Critic. in Baron. an. 258. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 266.) Nihil a Sixto in suo pontificatu gestum reperimus, nisi quod in Indiculo Depositionis Martyrum habetur, *Tertio Kalendas Julii, Petri in catacumbas, et Pauli Ostiense, Tusco et Basso Coss.* Bucherius cum hoc arcanum non intelligeret, scripsit in margine: *Nescio quid hic sibi velint hi consules, forte aliunde luxati.* Verum non de sanctorum Apostolorum passionis, sed de translationis tempore hic agitur. Idem habet Gestorum Pontificalium auctor, sed pontifices permutavit, ut sæpe solet, et pro Sixto Cornelium posuit, indeque Pseudo-Isidorus eandem historiam fictitiæ Cornelii Epistolæ inseruit. Caius, qui circa annum Christi CC. scripsit, tradit, Apostolorum trophæa tunc temporis in Vaticano et Ostiensi asservata fuisse. Hæc igitur trophæa in catacumbas transtulisse videtur Sixtus, magis in dies sæviente persecutionis ardore, ut ibi tutius stationes haberi possent. Ita recte Pearsonius, qui subjungit, *Hujus observationis utilitas, &c.* [See the preceding note.] Hæc Pearsonius, cujus librum, in quo de ea varietate agit, non vidi. Verum enimvero observatio hæc vanissima. Petrus non ultimo Neronis anno, sed undecimo martyrium subiit, ut suo loco demonstravi, ejusque natale die vicesimo nono Junii celebratum. Sed quia translationes sanctorum eo sæpe die, quo ad Deum migrarunt, vel colebantur, fieri solitæ erant, is dies a Sixto ad eam translationem faciendam electus; quod etiam in S. Urbani Papæ translatione præstitum fuisse anno CCXXI. notavimus. Neque refert, quod in Laterculo Sylvii legitur. Hinc enim tantum inferendum, aliam SS. Apostolorum translationem, quæ etiam

controversy between them. But it is generally agreed both by the Ancients and Moderns, that they both suffered martyrdom at the same time in the persecution under Nero at Rome. This Eusebius[15] shows out of Caius Romanus, Tertullian, Origen, and Dionysius of Corinth; who say, that the one was crucified and the other beheaded; and that their trophies or monuments were, the one in the *Via Ostiensis*, and the other in the Vatican, till Pope Xystus removed them into the catacombs, or subterraneous vaults, as the old *Indiculus Depositionis Martyrum* calls them, for greater security in the heat of persecution. And here it was, that St. Jerom[16] says, when he was a schoolboy at Rome, 'he often went with others of his companions into the *cryptæ* or *cemeteries* underground, to see their sepulchres among the rest of the martyrs.' So that it being unquestionable, that St. Peter and St. Paul were crowned with martyrdom at Rome, there is no doubt to be made, but that their festivals were anciently observed there and elsewhere, as other festivals of the martyrs. And the like may be

depositionis nomine ab antiquis designatur, in festo cathedræ S. Petri factam esse. Nam viii. Kalendas Martii cathedram S. Petri, non vero natalem ejus celebratum fuisse, certum fit ex Indiculo Depositionis Martyrum, Laterculo Sylvii antiquiore; in eo enim legitur, *Octavo Kalendas Martii natale Petri de cathedra;* ubi vides, etiam *natalis* nomen cuilibet festo attributum fuisse.

[15] L. 2. c. 25. (v. 1. p. 83. 31.) Παῦλος δὴ οὖν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθῆναι, καὶ Πέτρος ὡσαύτως ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι κατ' αὐτὸν ἱστοροῦνται. Καὶ πιστοῦταί γε τὴν ἱστορίαν ἡ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου εἰς δεῦρο κρατήσασα ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτόθι κοιμητηρίων πρόσρησις· οὐδὲν δ' ἧττον καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἀνὴρ, Γάϊος ὄνομα, κατὰ Ζεφυρῖνον Ῥωμαίων γεγονὼς ἐπίσκοπον· ὃς δὴ, Πρόκλῳ τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας προϊσταμένῳ γνώμης ἐγγράφως διαλεχθεὶς, αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν τόπων, ἔνθα τῶν εἰρημένων Ἀποστόλων τὰ ἱερὰ σκηνώματα κατατέθειται, φησίν· Ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι· ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσῃς ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανὸν, ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὠστίαν, εὑρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτην ἱδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ὡς δὲ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἄμφω καιρὸν ἐμαρτύρησαν, Κορινθίων ἐπίσκοπος Διονύσιος ἐγγράφως Ῥωμαίοις ὁμιλῶν, ὧδέ πως παρίστησιν· Ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοσαύτης νουθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου φυτείαν γεννηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε καὶ Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε· καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες ἡμᾶς, ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμόσε διδάξαντες, ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν.—L. 3. c. 1. (ibid. p. 88. 3.) Ος καὶ [Πέτρος] ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν. Τί δεῖ περὶ Παύλου λέγειν... καὶ ὕστερον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος μεμαρτυρηκότος. Ταῦτα Ὠριγένει κατὰ λέξιν ἐν τρίτῳ τόμῳ τῶν εἰς τὴν Γένεσιν ἐξηγητικῶν εἴρηται.

[16] In Ezek. c. 40. p. 636. (t. 5. p. 468 b.) .... Solebam cum cæteris ejusdem ætatis et propositi, diebus Dominicis sepulcra Apostolorum et Martyrum circuire; crebroque cryptas ingredi, quæ in terrarum profunda defossæ, &c.

concluded of all the other Apostles, who suffered martyrdom in the several countries where they preached the Gospel.

12. Besides these, the ancient Church kept a festival in memory of the Holy Innocents that were slain at our Saviour's birth. The ancient writers never speak of them but under the title of Christian martyrs. Cyprian[17] says, 'the nativity of Christ began *a martyriis infantium*, immediately with the martyrdom of those infants, that from two years old and under were slain for his name. That tender age, which was not yet able to fight, was fit to receive a crown. The innocent infants were slain for his name, that it might appear that they are innocent, who are slain for the sake of Christ: and hereby it was shown, that no one is free from the danger of persecution, seeing even such as these were martyred for his sake.' To the same purpose St. Hilary[18] says, 'Bethlehem flowed with the blood of the martyrs,' and 'that they were advanced to eternity by the glory of martyrdom.' So St. Austin[19]: 'These infants died for Christ, not knowing it: their parents bewailed them, dying martyrs: they could not yet speak, and yet for all that they confessed Christ: Christ granted them the honour to die for his name: Christ vouchsafed them the benefit of being washed from original sin in their own blood.' In like manner Prudentius[20], in his poetical way, thus sets forth their praises:

The festival of the Holy Innocents.

[17] Ep. 56. [al. 58.] ad Thibaritan. p. 123. (p. 257.) Christi nativitas a martyriis infantium statim cœpit, ut ob nomen ejus, a bimatu et infra qui fuerant, necarentur. Ætas, necdum habilis ad pugnam, idonea exstitit ad coronam; ut appareret, innocentes esse, qui propter Christum necantur: infantia innocens ob nomen ejus occisa est. Ostensum est neminem esse a periculo persecutionis immunem, quando et tales martyria fecerunt.

[18] In Matth. c. 1. (t. 1. p. 672 c. n. 6.) Post Judæorum insectationem et in exstinguendo eo profanæ plebis assensum Christus ad Gentes inanissimis religionibus deditas transit: et, Judæam relinquens, ignoranti eum sæculo colendus infertur, Bethlehem, id est, Judæa, martyrum sanguine redundante.... Non enim non erant ii, qui mortui putabantur; in æternitatis enim profectum per martyrii gloriam efferebantur.

[19] De Symbolo, l. 3. c. 4. t. 9. p. 303. [al. de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, Sermo alius.] (t. 6. p. 571 a.) Moriuntur parvuli pro Christo nescientes, parentes plangunt martyres morientes; ille nondum loquentes idoneos suos efficit testes.... Necdum loquuntur, et Christum confitentur.... Præstitit eis Christus ut pro Christo morerentur, præstitit ut suo sanguine ab originali peccato diluerentur.—Ep. 28. ad Hieron. See n. 26, following.—De Liber. Arbitrio, l. 3. c. 23. (t. 1. p. 638 c.) Non enim frustra etiam infantes illos, qui, cum Dominus Jesus Christus necandus ab Herode quæreretur, occisi sunt, in honorem martyrum receptos commendat ecclesia.

[20] Cathemerin. Hymn. de Epi-

'Hail, ye flowers of the martyrs, whom the enemies of Christ cut off in your first entrance upon the light, as men do roses when they first appear. Ye proto-victims of Christ, ye tender flock of sacrifices, play innocently with your crowns and garlands before the very altar.' St. Chrysostom[21] was of the same mind when he said, 'These infants received no harm by their death; it only translated them so much the sooner to the port and haven of rest and tranquillity.' And so the author of the *Opus Imperfectum*, under the name of Chrysostom[22], speaking of Herod's cruelty, says, 'he gave all the infants eternal life for the sake of one;' meaning, that he made them all martyrs for the sake of Christ, whom he thought to have slain among them. Before all these Irenæus[23] says, 'Christ when he was an infant made infants martyrs for himself, and sent them before him into his kingdom.' Pope Leo[24] and Fulgentius speak of them in the same style, as 'infant martyrs

phan. v. v. 125–132. (v. 1. p. 157.)

Salvete, flores martyrum,
Quos lucis ipso in limine,
Christi insecutor sustulit,
Ceu turba nascentes rosas.
Vox prima Christi victima,
Grex immolatorum tener,
Aram ante ipsam simplices
Palmis et coronis luditis.

[21] Hom. 9. in Math. p. 83. (t. 7. p. 132 d.) Τί τοίνυν ἐβλάβη τὰ παιδία, ἀναιρεθέντα ἐπὶ ὑποθέσει τοιαύτῃ, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἀκύμαντον ταχέως ἀπενεχθέντα λιμένα;

[22] In Matth. 2. p. 780. (Oper. Chrysostom. t. 6. p. 33 a.) Omnibus vitam æternam præstitit propter unum.

[23] L. 3. c. 18. (p. 240. 27.) Propter hoc et pueros eripiebat, qui erant in domo David, bene sortiti illo tempore nasci, ut eos præmitteret in suum regnum; ipse infans cum esset, infantes hominum martyres parans, propter Christum, qui in Bethlehem natus est Judæ, in civitate David interfectos, secundum Scripturas.

[24] Serm. 7. [al. 37. c. 3.] in Epiphan. p. 33. (t. 1. p. 139.) Ad hanc vos similitudinem parvulorum mysterium hodiernæ festivitatis invitat: et hanc vobis humilitatis formam adoratus a Magis puer Salvator insinuat: qui ut imitatoribus suis quid gloriæ pararet, ostenderet, ortus sui tempore editos martyrio consecravit ut in Bethlehem, ubi Christus natus est, geniti per communionem ætatis consortes fierent passionis.—Conf. Fulgent. Hom. 4. de Epiphania et Innocentibus. p. 541. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 109 e. 6.) .... Non solum istum puerum [Jesum] non invenisti: sed nec illis pueris aliquid nocuisti: immo inscius, quod illis proderat, hoc egisti. Per sævitiam quippe tuam sancti sunt martyres; qui per infantiam suam fuerant innocentes: quando per gratiam hujus pueri pro eo meruerunt mori; priusquam eum possent coram hominibus confiteri. Iste itaque puer, qui mundum creavit, qui mundum regit, qui omnia, quæcumque vult, facit, qui cuncta mirabili atque inseparabili ordine disponit, hoc ordinavit, hoc egit, ut per tuam invidiam furiosam illi pueri mortem susciperent pretiosam: et, quod eis ad salutem tuam præstare non posses amicus, hoc ad damnationem tuam faceres inimicus. Ad hoc ergo te permisit infantes occidere, ut illos de te faceret triumphare. Te ergo permisit ad nequitiam, illos perduxit ad palmam.

and co-partners in the passion of Christ, who suffered martyrdom for him without knowledge or grief.'

But Origen[25] goes a little further, and not only calls them the first-fruits of the martyrs, but says, 'their memorial was always celebrated in the Churches after the manner or order of the saints, as being the first martyrs that were slain for Christ.' And St. Austin says more than once[26], 'that the Church received them to the honour of her martyrs,' which seems to imply, that some peculiar festival was appointed for their commemoration. But whether this at first was a distinct festival from the Epiphany, or rather kept on the same day, is a matter that may bear some dispute; because Prudentius, Fulgentius, and Leo, speak of the innocents only upon this day, and not upon any other occasion.

The festival of the Maccabees.

13. But we are further to observe, that anciently they celebrated not only the festivals of the Christian martyrs, but also some of the more eminent martyrs of the Old Testament: such as the Seven Maccabees, whose courage in opposing the tyrant Antiochus Epiphanes, and dying for the defence of the Jewish Law, seems to have been generally over the whole Christian Church in the fourth century, about which time we find abundance of panegyrics made upon them. Chrysostom has three Homilies[27] upon this occasion, wherein he speaks of their festival being celebrated at Antioch with more than ordinary concourses of people. St. Austin[28] says, the Christians had a church there called by the name of the Maccabees: and he himself has two Sermons upon their festival[29], in which he shows that they were esteemed in reality Christian martyrs. And hence it appears that their feast was solemnly observed

[25] Hom. 3. de Diversis. t. 2. p. 436. (Ed. Ascensian. 1522. fol. 121. vers. 1.) Horum et memoria semper, ut dignum est, in ecclesiis celebratur, secundum integrum ordinem sanctorum, ut primorum martyrum pro Domino occisorum, et ut ipsa Bethleem primitias Domino martyrum, in qua natus est ipse Salvator, obtulisse videatur.

[26] De Libero Arbitrio, l. 3. c. 23. t. 1. p. 29. See n. 19, preceding.—Ep. 28. [al. 166.] ad Hieron. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 591 b.) In the same words as the passage cited in the third part of n. 19, preceding.

[27] Homm. 44, 49, 50. t. 1. (t. 2. pp. 622, 628, 631.)

[28] Hom. 109. de Divers. t. 10. p. 585. [al. Serm. 300. c. 6.] (t. 5. p. 1221 b.) Sanctorum Machabæorum basilica esse in Antiochia prædicatur: in illa scilicet civitate, quæ regis ipsius persecutoris nomine vocatur.

[29] As above, and Hom. 110. de Divers. [al. Serm. 301.] (ibid. p. 1221.] Magnum spectaculum, &c.

he says it began to be used in the monasteries not long before his time, which was about the year 1150. And it appears from a Decree of Alexander the Third, that it was not observed at Rome in his time, anno 1179. For he says[39], 'The feast of the Holy Trinity is diversely observed according to the custom of different countries; some keeping it on the Octaves of Pentecost, and others on the first Sunday before Advent. But in the Roman Church it is not used to be celebrated as any particular festival; for we say every day, Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost! and such other things as appertain to the praise of the Trinity.' So that Trinity Sunday being wholly unknown to the Ancients under that particular name, it is most probable this was the day on which a general commemoration was made of all the martyrs in the world, as St. Chrysostom's Homily[40] bears it in the title. For the multitude of martyrs being vastly great, it was impossible that particular days should be assigned to each of them; and therefore every Church chiefly celebrated the days of her own martyrs, which often came once or twice in a week[41], and added one solemn day for the commemoration of them all in general: of which I have nothing more particularly to remark, but that the Ancients on this day commonly exerted themselves, and showed the utmost of their skill in the art of oratory, of which many of them were great masters, in describing the passions, and setting forth the glory of those victories and trophies that were so frequently and so surprisingly acquired by the martyrs.

It is a beautiful stroke of Chrysostom's pen, in his Homily upon this occasion[42], with which I will end this chapter upon

[39] Decretal. Greg. M. l. 2. tit. 9. de Feriis, c. 2. (Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 2. p. 596. 18.) Festivitas S. Trinitatis, secundum consuetudines diversarum regionum, a quibusdam consuevit in octavis Pentecostes, ab aliis in Dominica prima ante adventum Domini celebrari. Ecclesia siquidem Romana in usu non habet, quod in aliquo tempore hujusmodi celebret spiritualiter [al. specialiter] festivitatem, cum singulis diebus, Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto! et [cætera] similia dicantur ad laudem pertinentia Trinitatis.—See also Microlog. de Observ. Eccles. c. 60. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 18. p. 489 h.) *De Officio Sanctæ Trinitatis.*

[40] See n. 305, preceding.

[41] Vid. Chrysostom. Hom. 40. in Juventin. et Maxim. t. 1. p. 546. (t. 2. p. 578.)—Hom. 65. de Martyr. t. 5. p. 971. (ibid. p. 650. [abest a Savil.] — Theodoret. Serm. 8. de Martyr. t. 4. p. 605. See before, b. 13. ch. 9. s. 5. v. 4. p. 536, the second part of n. 57.

[42] Hom. 74. de Martyr. Tot. Orb.

these festivals of the martyrs. 'The Devil,' says he, 'introduced death into the world, but the wisdom of God turned it to our honour and glory: for hereby he opened the way to martyrdom, and made our destruction become the occasion of a crown. The Devil designed to ruin us by death, but Christ inverted his design, and makes use of death to introduce us into heaven by martyrdom. Here, as in all other battles, there were armies engaged on both sides: the martyrs on the one side, and tyrants on the other. The tyrants were armed, and the martyrs naked; yet they that were naked got the victory, and they that carried arms were vanquished. What an astonishing engagement was this? He that is beaten proves victor over him that beats him; he that is bound overcomes him that is at liberty; he that is burnt tames him that burns him; and he that dies vanquishes him that puts him to death. These are astonishing things: but it is grace that works these miracles; they are above the strength of nature.' Thus the Ancients extolled their martyrs, those heroes of Christianity, by just praises and commendations, and endeavoured to provoke others to piety and virtue by their example, which was the great end and design of these holy solemnities and frequent meetings at the memorials of the martyrs.

t. 1. p. 896. (t. 2. p. 711 c. et p. 712 c.) *Ὥστε μὴ ἀλγῶμεν, ὅτι ἐγενόμεθα θνητοὶ, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστῶμεν, ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου ἀνεῴχθη ἡμῖν τὸ στάδιον τοῦ μαρτυρίου· ἀπὸ τῆς φθορᾶς ἐλάβομεν ὑπόθεσιν τῶν βραβείων· ἐντεῦθεν ἔχομεν ἀφορμὴν τῶν παλαισμάτων. Ὁρᾷς σοφίαν Θεοῦ· πῶς τὸ μέγιστον τῶν κακῶν, τὸ κεφάλαιον τῆς ἡμετέρας συμφορᾶς, ὅπερ εἰσήγαγεν ὁ Διάβολος, τὸν θάνατον λέγω, τοῦτον εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἡμετέραν μετέβαλε, διὰ τούτου πρὸς τὰ τοῦ μαρτυρίου βραβεῖα τοὺς ἀθλητὰς ἄγων. . . . Ἐκεῖνος εἰσήγαγεν, ἵνα ἀπολέσῃ, καὶ πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἐπαναγαγὼν πᾶσαν ἐκκόψῃ σωτηρίας ἐλπίδα· ὁ Χριστὸς δὲ αὐτὸ λαβὼν μετέστρεψε, καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰσήγαγε. . . . Καὶ ἐνταῦθα δύο παρατάξεις, ἡ μὲν τῶν μαρτύρων, ἡ δὲ τῶν τυράννων· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τύραννοι εἰσι καθωπλισμένοι, οἱ δὲ μάρτυρες γυμνῷ τῷ σώματι μάχονται, καὶ ἡ νίκη τῶν γυμνῶν, οὐ καθωπλισμένων, γίνεται. Τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐκπλαγείη, ὅτι ὁ μαστιζόμενος περιγίνεται τοῦ μαστίζοντος, ὁ δεδεμένος τοῦ λελυμένου, ὁ κατακαιόμενος τοῦ καίοντος, ὁ ἀποθνήσκων τοῦ ἀναιροῦντος; Εἴδες πῶς ταῦτα ἐκείνων φρικωδέστερα; ἐκεῖνα μὲν εἰ καὶ φοβερὰ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ φύσιν γίνεται. Ταῦτα δὲ πᾶσαν ὑπερβαίνει φύσιν καὶ πᾶσαν πραγμάτων ἀκολουθίαν· ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτός ἐστι τὰ κατορθούμενα.*

lemnity with him, which was observed with reading, psalmody, preaching, praying, and receiving the eucharist, as other solemn festivals. Paulinus[45] likewise takes notice of this particular circumstance, that they were used to invite their fellow-bishops to come and celebrate these their spiritual nativities with them: for so, he says, he himself was invited by Anastatius, bishop of Rome, to celebrate his birthday. The like we find in the Epistles of St. Ambrose[46], Pope Hilary[47], and several others[48].

Now the design of these anniversaries was very excellent to put bishops in mind of the great and weighty burden that was laid upon them, and to be a fresh occasion of recollecting with themselves how faithfully and conscientiously and carefully they had discharged the trust committed to them. Thus St. Austin represents the matter in one of his Sermons[49] upon

[45] Ep. 16. ad Delphin. (p. 175.) Deinde nos ipsos Romæ, cum solemni consuetudine ad beatorum Apostolorum natalem venissemus, tam blande quam honorifice excepit. Postea quoque, interposito tempore, etiam ad natalem suum invitare dignatus est.

[46] Ep. 5. [al. 4.] ad Felic. Episc. Comens. (t. 2. p. 763 c. n. 2. et n. 3.) Tum ego nostris fabulis intexui diem natalis tui.... Natalem autem tuum prosequemur nostris orationibus, &c.

[47] Ep. 2. ad Tarracon. (CC. t. 4. p. 1036 a.) Lectis in conventu fratrum, quos natalis mei festivitas congregarat, literis vestris.

[48] Sixtus, Ep. ad Ioan. Antioch. (CC. t. 3. p. 1261 c.] Audivit universa fraternitas, quæ ad natalis mei convenerat diem, &c.—Anastas. Bibliothecar. Vit. Adrian. 1. (Rom. 1718–35 t. 4, p. 252. in fin. num. 320.).. Et constituit ut quatuor vicibus in anno ipsum pharum [in B. Petri ecclesia] accendatur; id est, in Nativitate Domini, in Pascha, in Natali Apostolorum, et Natali Pontificis.

[49] Hom. 24. ex 50. t. 10. p. 172. [al. Serm. 383.] (t. 5. pp. 1484, seqq.) Die quidem omni, et omni hora, curaque omnino continua, dilectissimi, cogitare debet episcopus, quantæ dispensationis sarcinam gerat, qualem de illa rationem Domino reddat suo. Veruntamen cum dies anniversarius nostræ ordinationis exoritur, tunc maxime onus hujus officii, tanquam tunc primum imponatur, attenditur. Interest autem, quod eo die, quo id prius suscepimus, tantum quemadmodum gerendum esset, cogitavimus: at vero consequentibus diebus, præcipueque illo, quo ejus solemnitas agitur, non solum futura ejus, quemadmodum deinceps geri debeant, cauta prævisione consulimus, verum etiam præterita, quemadmodum gesta sint, solicita recordatione recolimus: ut nosmet ipsos in benefactis imitemur, et si qua culpanda transierunt, ne repetantur curemus, ut ignoscantur oremus: et accusationem Diaboli, ubi possumus, recte agendi sedulitate fugiamus: ubi autem non possumus, confitendi pietate vincamus. Sicut enim futura peccata, negligendo justitiam, committuntur; ita præterita, injustitiam defendendo, firmantur. Sicut ergo, ne fiant, prospicit caritas, ita facta delet humilitas: ut quæ jam non possunt recte agendo non admitti, possint saltem non superbiendo dimitti. Didicimus quippe dicere Patri nostro, qui est in cœlis, *Dimitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.* Quod ut veraciter dicere possimus, etiam inimicos nostros oportet utique diligamus, quos tamen habere,

this occasion. 'A bishop,' says he, 'ought to consider every day and every hour, and with a continual care, what a weighty dispensation is committed to him, and what an account thereof he is to make to his Lord. But when the anniversary day of our ordination returns, then the honour of this office is chiefly reflected on, as if it were then first imposed upon us. But there is this difference, that on the day when we first received the office we had only to consider how we ought to behave ourselves in it: but every day after, and especially on that day when the solemnity returns, we not only look forward, and with great caution and foresight consider what we ought to do for the time to come, but also look back to what is past and carefully recollect what we have already done; that we may go on to imitate ourselves if we have done any thing well, or, if otherwise we have done things that are blameworthy, be careful not to repeat them again in time to come. Therefore, on this solemnity of my ordination, I say to those who are my debtors by trespassing against me;—if any man becomes my enemy, because I tell him the truth; if I seem troublesome to any, because I give him good advice; if I am forced to offend

nisi cogente justitia, non debemus. Nam si homines nobis pro nostris malis meritis inimici sunt, non curandum est, ut eis debita dimittamus, sed timendum potius, ne reddamus. Quoniam si nos merito nostræ iniquitatis oderunt, nos eorum, non ipsi nostri sunt debitores. 2. Die ergo isto solemni episcopatus mei, prius paucis alloquar debitores meos, qui mihi nescientes apud Deum suffragantur, dum faciunt debita, quæ dimittam, ut et mea mihi debita dimitti promerear. Vobis itaque dico sive præsentibus, sive absentibus, quibus inimicus efficior verum prædicans, quibus consulendo videor onerosus, quorum requirens utilitatem cogor offendere voluntatem, *Nolite esse sicut equus et mulus, non habentes intellectum.* Nam et hæc jumenta eos calce morsuque appetunt, a quibus curantur: ut curentur eorum vulnera, contrectantur. Non parcis, non parco: adversaris, adversor: resistis, resisto. Lucta nos comparat, sed causa separat. Tu inimicus es medico, ego morbo: tu diligentiæ meæ, ego pestilentiæ tuæ. *Retribuerant,* inquit, *mihi mala pro bonis: ego autem orabam.* Quid orabat nisi, *Pater, ignosce illis: quia nesciunt quid faciunt? Cum vobis,* inquit, *detraxerint, et dixerint omne malum adversum vos propter justitiam, gaudete et exsultate, quia merces vestra multa est in cœlis.* Vos tamen corrigite perversitatem vestram, agnoscite caritatem nostram; reddite dilectionem dilectioni: nolumus majorem cum vestra perditione mercedem. Hæc debitoribus meis, quibus dimitto, ut dimittatur mihi, nunc pauca suffecerint. 3. Deinde alloquendi sunt paullulum etiam illi, quibus debitor sum. Nam sicut ait Apostolus, *Græcis et Barbaris, sapientibus et insipientibus, debitor sum.* Nam talis debitor etiam ego pro mearum virium exiguitate dispensationisque portiuncula, non quibusdam, sed omnibus sum. Verum nunc de his debitis loquor, quæ mihi dimitti, non a me exigi cupio. Neque enim sic tumore vanæ mentis extollor, ut audeam dicere, ex quo hujus

any man's will, whilst I seek his profit;—to these I say, "Be ye not like to horse and mule, which have no understanding." For these creatures chiefly kick and bite those who take care of them and only touch them gently to cure their wounds. So you and I are at strife one with the other; but the cause makes a distinction. Thou art an enemy to thy physician, I only an enemy to thy disease: thou art an enemy to my diligence, I only to thy pestilential distemper. "They rewarded me evil for good," says he, [meaning Christ, as speaking in the Psalmist,] "but I give myself unto prayer." What did he [Christ, speaking in his own words [50],] pray? "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." "Rejoice and be exceeding glad," says Christ, "when men revile you, and say all manner of evil against you for righteousness' sake: for great is your reward in heaven." But we would have you correct your perverseness, and acknowledge our charity, and render love for love: we would not have our reward augmented by your destruction. Next I must speak to those to whom I am a debtor. For I am not so vain as to think that I have injured no man since I first took the burden of this office upon me. I know my infirmity, and pray to the Lord my God day and

muneris sarcinam porto, nullum a me hominem perperam læsum. Hoc cuilibet homini tam multis et molestis actibus occupato atque distento, ne dicam impossibile, certe difficile est: quanto magis mihi, qui novi infirmitatem meam, quam cum meis et pro me vestris orationibus diebus ac noctibus offero sanandam Domino Deo meo. Diversarum ergo curarum æstibus ac difficultatibus conturbatus, si quem forte non, ut poscebat, audivi, si quem tristius quam opus erat aspexi, si in quem verbum durius quam oportebat emisi, si quem corde contribulatum et opis indigum responsione incongrua conturbavi, si quem pauperem mihi forte in aliud intento importunius instantem vel prætermisi, vel distuli, vel etiam nutu aspero contristavi; si cui de me falsi aliquid tanquam homini de homine suspicanti, justo acerbius indignatus sum, si quis in sua conscientia non agnovit, quod de illo humanitus suspicatus sum; vos, quibus pro his atque hujusmodi offensis esse me fateor debitorem, simul me vestrum credite dilectorem. Nam pullos, quos fovet, sæpe in angustiis, sed non toto pedis pondere calcat et mater, nec ideo desinit esse mater. Dimittite, ut dimittatur vobis. Dimittite amanti vos debita difficultatis, qui nec contra inimicos debita tenere debetis crudelitatis. Ad summam, omnes obsecro, commendate Domino curam pro vobis meam: hinc enim juste expeto pro me vestram, ut quicquid mearum est in præteritum offensionum, propitius ignoscat, non severus agnoscat. Quod mihi deinceps temporis sub hac sarcina erit, iter agentem regat, et suis oculis placentem vobisque utilem faciat; ut non horrorem et pœnam meam, sed gaudium et coronam meam, vos ejus conspectus inveniat.

[50] [Compare Ps. 109, 4 and 5, with Luke 23, 34. Ed.]

night, and beg the assistance of your prayers for the cure of it. If then in the hurry and difficulty of various cares I have at any time been so distracted as not to hear the petition of him that made suit to me; if I have looked upon any with a sourer countenance than there was occasion for; if I have given any one sharper words than I ought to have done; if I have troubled any one that was in anguish of spirit, and needed my help, by an improper answer; if I have overlooked any poor man importuning me, when I was intent upon some other business, or put him off to another time, or grieved his soul by any sharp sign or intimation; if I have been above measure angry at any one for entertaining any false suspicion of me, as one man is apt to be jealous of another; or if I have humanly suspected any one as guilty of a crime, from which his own conscience could clear him;—I beseech all you, to whom I confess myself a debtor for these and the like offences, to believe me to be your debtor. For the tender mother, when she is in great straits, sometimes treads, though not with her whole weight, upon her young whom she cherishes, and yet ceases not to be a mother. Forgive me, that ye may be forgiven: and commend my care for you to the Lord, that he may mercifully pardon my past offences, and guide my way under this burden for the future, so as may be pleasing in his eyes, and profitable for you; that ye may be found my joy and crown, and not my confusion and punishment at his appearance.'

These are pious thoughts and excellent contemplations, flowing with expressions of great humility and charity; and they serve to show us, both what a deep sense the Ancients had of the weight and burden of the episcopal office, and also after what manner they entertained their auditories with useful discourses upon these anniversary festivals of their own ordination.

Of festivals kept in memory of any great deli-

3. Another sort of festivals was observed as annual thanksgivings to God for any great favours and blessings vouchsafed by God to his Church. Thus Sozomen[50] says, the Church of

[50] L. 6. c. 2. (v. 2. p. 221. 7.) Ἀμέλει τοι τὴν ἡμέραν, καθ' ἣν τάδε συνέβη, ἣν Γενέσια τοῦ Σεισμοῦ προσαγορεύουσιν, εἰσέτι καὶ νῦν Ἀλεξανδρεῖς ἐτησίαν ἑορτὴν ἄγουσι· λύχνους τε πλείστους ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν καίοντες, καὶ χαριστηρίους λιτὰς τῷ Θεῷ προσφέροντες, λαμπρῶς μάλα καὶ εὐλαβῶς ταύτην ἐπιτελοῦσιν.—Ammian. Marcellin. l. 26. c. 10. in fin. (p. 472.) Hoc novatore adhuc superstite, cujus actus multiplices docui-

rerances or signal mercies vouchsafed by God to his Church.

Alexandria kept an anniversary thanksgiving upon the twelfth of the Kalends of August, that is, the twenty-fifth of June, for their deliverance from a terrible earthquake and inundation of the sea, in the reign of Julian, which was so great, that boats were found upon the tops of houses. In memory of this they kept a festival, which they called Γενέσια τοῦ Σεισμοῦ, *the Memorial of the Earthquake,* which was observed in the time of Sozomen with great solemnity, the people offering eucharistical prayers to God, and setting up lights all over the city for joy. The Constantinopolitans kept such another festival on the twenty-fourth of September, in memory of their deliverance from an earthquake, which is mentioned by Marcellinus Comes in his Chronicon[51], as lasting with great violence for eleven days together. Among these, we may also reckon their thanksgiving after any signal victories; such as that of Constantine, over the tyrant Licinius, whereby the Christians were delivered from the oppression of all their persecutors, and gave God solemn thanks and praise both in city and country for the glorious success of Constantine's arms, and their own deliverance by his victories, as Eusebius more than once[52] declares, in setting forth the great achievements of Constantine for the Christian Church. So he, that had ordered all possible honour to be done to the martyrs[53], had himself a share in

mus et interitum, diem duodecimum Kal. Augustas, consule Valentiniano primum cum fratre, horrendi terrores per omnem orbis ambitum grassati sunt subito, quales nec fabulæ nec veridicæ nobis antiquitates exponunt. Paullo enim post lucis exortum, densitate prævia fulgurum acrius vibratorum tremefacta concutitur omnis terreni stabilitas ponderis, mareque dispulsum retro fluctibus evolutis abscessit, ut, retecta voragine profundorum, species natantium multiformes limo cernerentur hærentes: valliumque vastitates et montium tunc, ut opinari dabatur, suspicerent radios solis, quos primigenia rerum sub immensis gurgitibus amandavit... Ingentes aliæ naves, extrusæ rabidis flatibus, culminibus insedere tectorum, ut Alexandriæ contigit.

[51] Cos. Basilio. (ap. Galland. t. 10. p. 350 b.) Urbs regia per quadraginta continuos dies assiduo terræ motu quassata magnopere sese afflicta deplanxit. Ambæ Troadenses porticus corruerunt, aliquantæ ecclesiæ vel scissæ sunt, vel collapsæ. Statua Theodosii Magni in foro Tauri super cochlidem columnam posita corruit, duobus fornicibus ejusdem collapsis. Hunc formidolosum diem Byzantii celebrant 8. Kalend. Octobris.

[52] Hist. Eccles. l. 10. c. 9. (v. 1. p. 493. 6.) Ἀφῄρητο γοῦν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πᾶν δέος, τῶν πρὶν αὐτοὺς πιεζόντων· λαμπρὰς δ' ἐτέλουν καὶ πανηγυρικὰς ἑορτῶν ἡμέρας, κ. τ. λ.—De Vit. Constant. l. 2. c. 19. (ibid. p. 545. 30.) Χοροὶ δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ὕμνοι τὸν παμβασιλέα Θεὸν πρώτιστα πάντων, ὄντα δὴ τοῦτον ἐδίδασκον.

[53] Vid. Euseb. de Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 638. 9.) Τῷ νεύματι βασιλέως καὶ μαρτύρων ἡμέρας ἐτίμων, καιρούς θ' ἑορτῶν ἐκκλησίαις ἐδόξαζον.

the panegyrics that were made upon them, and next under God was celebrated as the great supporter of the Christian faith. But these seem not to have been festivals of long continuance, but to have ended their period with the life of the emperor, on whose account they were observed in the Church.

Of the feast of the Annunciation.

4. But from this time festivals grew and multiplied in the Church. Hospinian[54] thinks the feast of the Annunciation was as old as Athanasius, because there is mention made of it in a Sermon[55] that goes under his name. Others carry it higher to the time of Gregory Thaumaturgus, because there is a Sermon also attributed to him[56] upon the same subject. But the best critics, Dr. Cave[57], Du Pin[58], Hamon L'Estrange[59], and Rivet[60], reject both these as spurious writings: and even Bel-

[54] De Fest. Christian. (p. 69. col. sinistr.) Festum hoc a Pontificiis celebratur hodie in solius B. Virginis Mariæ honorem et memoriam ejus, quod conceptio Filii Dei juxta carnem Mariæ annuntiata ab Angelo Gabriele fuit. Athanasius, qui floruit circa annos Domini 340. primus de festo hoc quædam retulit, in enarratione Evangelii de sancta Deipara. Sed, ut ex illius verbis apparet, non tam in honorem Mariæ, quam Christi Domini, celebratum olim fuit: immo hujus potius, quam illius festum fuit. Sic enim Athanasius, *Festum hoc*, inquit, *unum est ex Dominicis, atque adeo primarium et prorsus venerandum, utpote quod pro ordine et digestione rerum, quæ in Evangelio de Christo prædicantur, sacrosanctum habeatur, quippe in quod de Filii e cœlis descensu agatur.*

[55] Serm. de S. Deipara. (t. 2. p. 334 b.) .... Καὶ πρότερον ἐπισημαινόμενοι ὑπαναμμνήσκομεν, ὅτι μία τῶν Δεσποτικῶν πρώτη τε καὶ πάνσεπτος ἑορτὴ, κατὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων τάξιν καὶ σύνταξιν τῶν ὑποκειμένων ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Χριστὸν κηρύγμασιν, ὑπάρχουσα, τοῦ θείου εὐαγγελισμοῦ κλητὴ ἁγία ἡμέρα, περὶ τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάσεως τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατασκευάζει τὸ κήρυγμα.

[56] [In the Works of Gregory Thaumaturgus, Paris. 1622, there are three Sermons entitled *In Annuntiationem Sanctissimæ Dei Genetricis Virginis Mariæ.* See at pp. 9, 15, 25, respectively. Ed.]

[57] Hist. Liter. (t. 1. p. 95, 96.) Scripta ei [Gregorio Thaumaturgo] supposita: .... *In Annuntiationem S. Dei Genitricis Sermones* 3: quorum tertius sub nomine Chrysostomi apud Lipomannum et Surium habetur.—Ibid. (p. 146.) Et *Sermo in Annuntiationem Deiparæ.* Stylus neutiquam est Athanasii: videtur post hæreseos Monotheleticæ exortum scriptus, &c.

[58] Biblioth. (t. 1. p. 186.) Les trois Sermons de l'Annunciation sont du stile de Procle de Constantinople, comme il a esté remarqué par celui qui a fait des Notes sur les Homelies de cet auteur.—Ibid. (t. 2. p. 41.) L'homelie de l'Annunciation ou de la Vierge, est aussi d'un auteur plus nouveau que Saint Athanase: parce qu'il s'attache a réfuter exprès l'erreur de Nestorius et celle des Monothelites.

[59] Alliance of Divine Offices, ch. 5. p. 148. (Reprint, p. 220.) There pass two homilies, &c.

[60] Critica Sacra, l. 3. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 1104. col. sinistr.) Homilia [Athanasii] de Annuntiatione, seu de Sanctissima Deipara Virgine, est supposititia. Et tamen oblectant se ejus allegatione Jesuitæ, quia Mariæ invocatio hic stabilitur, &c.

larmin and Labbe[61] reckon them dubious. They were written by Maximus, or some other after the time that the Monothelite heresy appeared in the world, which was in the seventh century. So the antiquity of this festival cannot be deduced from them. Neither could it be a festival in those times by the ancient rules of the Church, which forbad the celebration of all festivals in Lent, except the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, as appears from the Council of Laodicea[62]. But before the time of the Council of Trullo it was come into use. For that Council[63], renewing the foresaid prohibition of Laodicea, makes a further exception in behalf of the Annunciation: forbidding all festivals to be kept in Lent, except the Sabbath and the Lord's-day, and the holy Annunciation; which shows that by this time it was become a noted festival: and therefore we may date its original from the seventh century, when we find sermons began to be made upon it.

the festival called *Hypapante*, afterwards *the Purification* and *Candlemas-day*.

5. Another festival of later date was that which is commonly called *the Purification of the Virgin Mary*, or *Candlemas-day*. This at first among the Greeks went by the name of *Hypapante*, Ὑπαπαντὴ, which denotes *the meeting* of the Lord by Simeon in the temple, in commemoration of which occurrence it was first made a festival in the Church; some say in the time of Justin, the Emperor; others in the time of his successor Justinian, anno 542. There is indeed an Homily among St. Chrysostom's works[64], which, if it were genuine, would carry this feast an hundred years higher; for it is upon this festival under this very name of *Hypapante*. But all learned men are agreed that it is none of his. And particularly Leo Allatius cites a passage out of Georgius Hamartolus's

[61] [De Scriptor. Eccles. (t. 1. p. 373.) Bellarminus nec probat, nec rejicit, &c. — Vid. Bellarmin. de Scriptor. Eccles. (p. 46.) De Sermonibus in Annuntiationem et Theophaniam Dominicam, ut etiam de Libello de Anima ad Satianum, nihil certi habeo, cum nec Veteres horum operum miminerint, nec tamen convinci possit eos esse suppositities. Ed.]

[62] C. 51. (t. 1. p. 1505 b.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν Τεσσαρακοστῇ μαρτύρων γενέθλιον ἐπιτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων μνείαν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς Σάββατοις καὶ Κυριακαῖς.

[63] C. 3. (t. 6. p. 1166 e.) Ἐν πάσαις τῆς ἁγίας Τεσσαρακοστῆς τῶν νηστειῶν ἡμέραις, παρεκτὸς Σαββάτου καὶ Κυριακῆς, καὶ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Εὐαγγελισμοῦ ἡμέρας, γινέσθω ἡ τῶν προηγιασμένων ἱερὰ λειτουργία.

[64] Juxt. Ed. Ducæan. t. 6. Hom. 22. de Occursu et Simeone. (Ed. Bened. t. 2. p. 812. inter Spuria.) Εἰς τὴν Ὑπαπαντὴν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ εἰς τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ εἰς τὸν Συμεῶνα λόγος.

Chronicon[65], which shows that there was no such festival in Chrysostom's time, but that it was first instituted in the reign of Justinian. 'At this time began the Hypapante to be celebrated,' says he, 'which before was not numbered among the festivals of our Lord. For Chrysostom says the festivals of Christ's economy here upon earth were proportioned to the number of the days of the creation of the world. The first is his Nativity in the flesh; the second, Epiphany; the third, the day of his Passion; the fourth, the day of his glorious Resurrection; the fifth, his Assumption into heaven; the sixth, the descent of the Holy Ghost; the seventh, the great day of the General Resurrection, which has no succession nor end. For that is an eternal festival, or perpetual Sabbath and rest for the people of God, to be celebrated with much joy and gladness by those that shall be heirs of such things as "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him."' Thus far Georgius Hamartolus out of Chrysostom. And all the historians that come after him agree in the same thing, that this was no festival in the Church till the time of Justin, or Justinian. Cedrenus[66] fixes its original to the last year of Justin. But Landulphus Sagax[67], Siffridus

[65] In Vit. Justin. ap. Allat. de Dominic. Hebdomad. Græcor. n. 2. (ad calc. Allatii de Consensione, &c. pp. 1403. 4.) Καὶ ἡ Ὑπαπαντὴ ἔλαβεν ἀρχὴν ἑορτάζεσθαι, ἥτις οὐκ ἔστιν ἐναρίθμιος ταῖς Δεσποτικαῖς ἑορταῖς· ὁ γάρ τοι θεῖος Χρυσόστομος οὕτως λέγει· Ἐν ἓξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πάντα, καθὼς γέγραπται, τῇ δὲ ἑβδόμῃ κατέπαυσε. Διὸ καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγος, ζητήσας καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλὸς, εὐδοκήσας καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσας, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν, τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς κοσμοποιΐας τὰς ἑορτὰς παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν τῆς αὐτοῦ οἰκονομίας. Πρώτη μέν ἐστι καὶ ῥίζα τῶν ἑορτῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ κατὰ σάρκα ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου Μαρίας μετὰ τὴν σύλληψιν Γένεσις· δευτέρα ἡ Ἐπιφάνεια· τρίτη ἡ τοῦ Σωτηρίου Πάθους ἡμέρα· τετάρτη ἡ ὑπερένδοξος Ἀνάστασις, καθ' ἣν καὶ ἐν τοῖς καταχθονίοις γινόμενος ὁ Λυτρωτὴς συνανέστησε τοὺς δικαίους, καὶ τοὺς πιστεύσαντας· πέμπτη δὲ ἡ πρὸς οὐρανοὺς αὐτοῦ Ἀνάληψις, ὡς καὶ ἐν πέμπτῃ διεπράχθη τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἡμέρᾳ· ἕκτη δὲ ἡ τῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως ἡμέρα τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος· ἑβδόμη ἡ προσδοκωμένη τῆς καθολικῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάδοχος ἡμερα· τότε γὰρ ἑορτάσουσιν ὄντως μετὰ πολλῆς χαρᾶς καὶ εὐφροσύνης οἱ μέλλοντες κληρονομεῖν, ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

[66] Compend. p. 300. (Hist. s. Annal. ap. Byzant. Hist. Scriptor. t. 8. p. 289. b. 9.) Ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ δὲ ἐτυπώθη ἑορτάζειν ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν ἑορτὴς τῆς Ὑπαπαντῆς, τῆς μέχρι τότε μὴ ἑορταζομένης.

[67] Vit. Justin. (ap. Paul. Diacon. Hist. Miscel. p. 481. ap. Murator. t. 1. p. 108 e.) Anno decimo quinto Justiniani imperii, mense Octobri, facta est mortalitas Byzantii. Et eodem anno Hypapante Domini

Presbyter[68], Martin Polonus[69], Nicephorus[70], Sigebert[71], and Paulus Diaconus[72], cited by Xylander[73], and Suicerus[74], deduce it only from the reign of Justinian. And Baronius himself[75] does not deny it, only he would have it first instituted in honour of the Virgin Mary, which the very name of *Hypapante* confutes, which signifies the coming of Simeon *to meet* the Lord in his temple, according to the revelation made to him, "that he should not see death, till he had seen the Lord's Christ:" and the Greeks always reckoned it among those festivals which they called *Festa Dominica, Festivals appointed in honour of our Lord,* as Leo Allatius himself[76] informs us.

sumpsit initium, ut celebraretur apud Byzantium secunda die Februarii mensis.

[68] Epitom. Hist. l. 1. (ap. Rer. German. Scriptor. t. 1. p. 1024.) De festo Ὑπαντή.

[69] Chronic. Colon. Agripp. 1616. See n. 73, following.

[70] L. 17. c. 28. (t. 2. p. 779 d. 2.) Τάττει δὲ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος Ὑπαπαντὴν ἄρτι πρῶτος ἀπανταχοῦ τῆς γῆς ἑορτάζεσθαι.

[71] An. 542. (ap. Rer. German. Scriptor. t. 1. p. 735.) Constantinopoli mortalitate magna insurgente, statuta est solemnitas Purificationis beatæ Mariæ, quæ Græce Ὑπαντὴ [al. Ὑπαπαντὴ,] id est, *obviatio*, dicitur, eo quod die illo Symeon obviaverit oblato in templum Domino; et ita mortalitas illa cessavit.

[72] L. 16. See the next note.

[73] Not. in Cedren. p. 688. (ap. Byzant. Hist. Scriptor. t. 9. p. 14. n. 147.) *Hypapante.* Quod nimirum quasi in occursum prodiretur Christo in templo dedicando. Est enim solemnitas, quam usitate *Purificationis* dicimus, quod primum ex Martini Poloni Chronicis didici, qui tamen pestis causa institutam dicit sub Justiniano Magno: quod idem est apud Nicephorum 17, 18, et consentit, quod Sigebertus perhibuit, id fuisse anno a Christo natalibus 542, quo sane tempore Justinus decesserat, vel ipso Cedreno teste. Memimit Paulus Diaconus, l. 16. Rer. Rom.

[74] Thes. Eccles, (t. 2. p. 1374.) Institutum vero hoc festum, &c.

[75] An. 544. (t. 7. p. 350 b.) Quod vero non amplius quam tribus mensibus civitatem Constantinopolitanam occuparit [pestis], miraculo tribuitur; quod, licet neque a Procopio vel Evagrio recenseatur, haud tamen oblivione sepultum penitus relictum est. Nam tantum beneficium solemni die festo in honorem Dei genitricis Mariæ instituto, anniversariaque die in ecclesia repetendo, remansit posteris perpetua memoria consignatum; cum videlicet idem *Hypapante* est nominatum, nempe humilis occursus Symeonis, cum Deipara suum Filium, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, in templum intulit; cujus festi diei in occidente Gelasium Papam fundamenta jecisse, cum Lupercalia penitus abstulit, in notis ad Romanum Martyrologium diximus.

[76] [Ubi supr. ad calc. de Consensione. (pp. 1403, 1404.) Illud ante omnia animadvertendum est, dies Dominicas, quæ Græcis Κυριακαὶ sunt, multum diversas esse a diebus festis Dominicis, sive magis Herilibus, quas Græci Δεσποτικὰς ἑορτὰς vocant, seu Κυριακάς. Cum enim illi dies festas Domini ac Deiparæ, quibus nil magis in solemnitatibus ecclesiasticis est, complectuntur; hinc Dominicæ, sive Heriles, et a Christo, qui Κύριος est et Δεσπότης, et Deipara Δέσποινα, Dominus et Herus et Dominica [? leg. Domina], nomen sibi vindicant. Et primum

6. He that would see more of the increase and progress of festivals, may consult Hospinian[77], who has noted the original of every distinct festival successively as they were instituted in the following ages of the Church. I only note that he allows confessors and other holy men to have had their memorials something earlier than Cardinal Bona himself will allow. For Bona[78] thinks this honour was only paid to martyrs properly so called, and not to confessors, or any other saints for the four first ages: and he says, 'that in Fronto's Kalendar, written about nine hundred years ago, there are not above four saints that were not martyrs, named throughout the whole year, viz. Pope Sylvester, Pope Leo, Martin of Tours, and Gregory the Great.' But Hospinian's observation is more exact: for Sozomen[79] says expressly, that it was customary in Palestine long before to celebrate the anniversary days of such men as had been eminent among them for piety and virtue, such as Hilarion of Gaza, Aurelius of Anthedon, Alexion of Berthagathon, and Alaphion of Asalea; who were no martyrs, but only men of renown for their piety, by whose virtues the Christian religion had made a considerable progress in many Heathen cities in the reign of Constantius; for which reason

The original of festivals in honour of confessors and other holy men.

quidem non omnes Virginis solemnitates in horum numero collocabantur, sed eæ solummodo, quæ Virginem ipsam et Christum respicerent, ut est Purificatio vel Hypapante: &c. Ed.]

[77] De Festis Christian, c. 4. (pp. 22, seqq.) Historia primitivæ et recentioris Ecclesiæ de Festis, &c.

[78] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 15. p. 2. (p. 208.) Citati patres [Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Augustinus] de solis martyribus loquuntur, quia confessorum festivitates serius in ecclesia receptæ sunt; et in Frontonis Calendario, ante nonagentos annos scripto, non nisi quatuor ascripti sunt, Martinus scilicet Turonensis, Gregorius Magnus Leo Papa, et Sylvester.

[79] L. 3. c. 14. (v. 2. p. 114. 2. et ibid. 31.) Διέπρεπε δὲ τότε ἐνθάδε Ἱλαρίων ὁ θεσπέσιος.... Ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δὲ θεοφιλὴς ἐγένετο, ὡς ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτοῦ τάφῳ πολλοὺς ἰᾶσθαι κάμνοντας καὶ δαιμονῶντας· καὶ τόγε παραδοξότατον, παρά τε Κυπρίοις, οὗ πρότερον ἐτάφη, καὶ παρὰ Παλαιστινοῖς, παρ' οἷς ἐστι νῦν. Συμβὰν γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐν Κύπρῳ διατρίβοντα τελευτῆσαι, πρὸς τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἐκηδεύθη, καὶ ἐν πολλῇ τιμῇ καὶ θεραπείᾳ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἦν· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ἡσύχας, ὃς εὐδοκιμώτατος ἐγένετο τῶν αὐτοῦ μαθητῶν, κλέψας τὸ λείψανον, διεκόμισεν εἰς Παλαιστίνην, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ μοναστηρίῳ ἔθαψε· καὶ τὸ ἐξ ἐκείνου, δημοτελῆ καὶ μάλα λαμπρὰν ἐνθάδε ἐτήσιον ἑορτὴν ἄγουσιν οἱ ἐπιχώριοι· ὧδε γὰρ Παλαιστινοῖς ἔθος γεραίρειν τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς γενομένους· ὥσπερ ἀμέλει καὶ Αὐρήλιον τὸν Ἀνθηδόνιον, καὶ Ἀλεξίωνα τὸν ἀπὸ Βηθαγάθωνος, καὶ Ἀλαφίωνα τὸν ἀπὸ Ἀσαλέας· οἱ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν γενόμενοι χρόνον, ἐπὶ τῆς παρούσης βασιλείας εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἀνδρείως ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ ἐπολιτεύσαντο, καὶ ταῖς οἰκείαις ἀρεταῖς, ἐν Ἑλληνιζούσαις ἄγαν ταῖς τῇδε πόλεσι καὶ κώμαις, εἰς ἐπίδοσιν ἤγαγον τὴν θρησκείαν.

their memory was celebrated in those places with the anniversary festivals. And so Baronius[80] observes out of St. Jerom[81], 'that Hilarion himself kept a vigil preceding the day of Antonius's death in commemoration of him.' Therefore whatever might be the custom of the Western Church, it is plain in the Eastern parts the anniversary commemoration of confessors and other eminent saints was introduced a little sooner.

[80] An. 358. n. 23. (t. 3. p. 781 e.) De sancto Hilarione scribit Hieronymus, quod cognito, licet longe absens, Antonii obitu, illuc magno labore se contulit, ea nimirum ex causa, ut anniversarium illius dormitionis diem eodem, in quo defunctus erat loco, præviis nocturnis vigiliis celebraret.

[81] Vit. Hilarion. c. 26. [al. 31.] (t. 2. p. 30 c.) Confessus est fratribus instare diem dormitionis beati Antonii; et pervigilem noctem in ipso, quo defunctus fuerat loco, a se [ei] debere celebrari.

BOOK XXI.

OF THE FASTS IN USE IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the Quadragesimal or Lent Fast.

1. NEXT to the festivals observed in the Ancient Church, we are to take a view of their solemn and stated times of fasting. These, like the festivals, were some of them weekly, and some annual, that is, such as returned at a certain season only once a year. Among those that came only once a year, the Quadragesimal or Lent fast, was the most famous. The Greeks called it Τεσσαρακοστὴ, and the Latins *Quadragesima*, both which words denote the number *forty*, whence this fast for some reason was called *Quadragesimal;* but whether for its being a fast of forty days, or only forty hours, is variously disputed among learned men. They of the Romish Church generally maintain that it was always a fast of forty days, and that as such it was of apostolical institution. And there are some of the Protestant communion who are of the same opinion. Others think it was only of ecclesiastical institution, and therefore as it was variable and alterable by the Church's power, so it was variously observed in different Churches, and grew by degrees from a fast of forty hours to a fast of forty days, still retaining the name of *the Quadragesimal fast* under all its variations. This is what Bishop Morton[1], and Bishop

What this fast was originally, forty days or forty hours.

[1] Catholic Appeal, b. 2. ch. 26. s. 2. (p. 304.) That the manner of the Lent fast, used anciently, was variable, &c.

only about the time of Easter, but about the manner of fasting. For some thought they ought to fast one day, others two, others more; and others measured their day (or *their fast*, as Valesius[11] observes it ought to be read) by the computation of forty hours, joining day and night together. And this variety among those that observe the fast did not begin in our age, but long before us among our ancestors, many of whom probably not being very curious and exact in their observation, they handed down to posterity the custom as it had been introduced among them through simplicity or private fancy. And yet, nevertheless, all these lived peaceably one with another, and we also keep peace together. For the difference in observing the fast does only so much the more commend the common unity of faith in which all are agreed.'

I must not here conceal from the reader, that there are several learned men who think one clause in this passage ought to be read a little otherwise. They say, Ruffin's old translation[12] and Sir H. Savil's copy[13] read it thus: 'Some fast one day, some two, some more, some forty days.' Hence they also argue, that a Lent of forty days was observed in the time of Irenæus. So Bishop Beveridge[14], Bishop Patrick[15], Bishop

πολὺ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν· τῶν παρὰ τὸ ἀκριβὲς, ὡς εἰκὸς, κρατούντων τὴν καθ' ἁπλότητα καὶ ἰδιωτισμὸν συνήθειαν εἰς τὸ μετέπειτα πεποιηκότων· καὶ οὐδὲν ἔλαττον πάντες οὗτοι εἰρήνευσάν τε, καὶ εἰρηνεύομεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· καὶ ἡ διαφωνία τῆς νηστείας τὴν ὁμόνοιαν τῆς πίστεως συνίστησιν.

[11] [In loc. (p. 247. n. 1.) Miror tot homines eruditos, qui hunc Irenæi locum in suis libris exposuerunt, ejus vitium non animadvertisse. Quis enim est sensus horum verborum? aut quis unquam credat fuisse homines, qui quadraginta horarum spatio diem metirentur. Atqui quadraginta horæ biduum jejunantibus efficiunt. Equidem non dubito, quin Irenæus ita scripserit, Οἱ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας, ἡμερινάς τε καὶ νυκτερινὰς, συμμετροῦσι τὴν νηστείαν, qua scriptura nihil planius esse potest. Quare aut Irenæus omnino ita scripsit, aut certe ita scribere debuit. Sed antiquarii, vocabulo ex superiore linea huc translato, locum corruperunt. *Grischov.*]

[12] [Vid. Ed. Froben. Basil. 1539. (p. 123. ult. lin.) Quidam enim putant uno tantum die observari debere jejunium, alii duobus, alii vero pluribus, nonnulli etiam quadraginta, ita ut horas diurnas nocturnasque computantes diem statuunt. Ed.]

[13] [His own private copy of Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, on the margin of which he had written various notes, which were afterwards used and thankfully acknowledged by Valesius (v. 1. p. 247. n. 1. Ed. Cantabr.) in his edition of 1659. See Chalmers' Biographical Dictionary, London, 1816, v. 27. pp. 204, 205. See also the Biographie Universelle, Paris, 1825. v. 40. p. 518. Ed.]

[14] Cod. Canon. Vindic. l. 3. c. 7. (Cotel. v. 2. pp. 159, seqq.)

[15] Of Fasting in Lent, ch. 16. p. 143. (Oxford, 1840. p. 143.) For Irenæus, &c.

Hooper[16], and others, who have written peculiar Dissertations on this subject. On the other hand, all the manuscripts used by Stephens[17] and Valesius[18] in their accurate editions are so pointed as to make the word *forty* refer, not to days, but hours only. It is no easy matter to determine a point of such a critical nature between so many learned men; but, if I may be allowed to conjecture in so obscure a case, I should incline to compromise the dispute, and, as it were, divide the matter between them, by saying, first, that in the time of Irenæus and Tertullian, the Catholics allowed the fast of forty hours between our Saviour's death and resurrection, call it a fast of one or two days, as we please, to have the nature of an evangelical command, partly from the example and practice of the Apostles, and partly from those words of our Saviour, "The days will come that the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast:" which, as we have seen, they understood of the time of about forty hours that our Saviour lay in the grave; from whence it is not improbable that the first notion and name of the most strict Quadragesimal fast might take its original. Which is enough to prove the perpetuity of a Quadragesimal fast before Easter as of constant use in the Church.

2. Because at the same time that Irenæus and Tertullian wrote, there were other additional days of fasting superadded to these by several Churches, but with a great deal of variety in their number and observation, being at every Church's liberty to appoint what number of these additional days she thought fit, which, though they were in some Churches more, and in some fewer, and none of them full forty days, till after the time of Gregory the Great, yet they all went by the name of *the Quadragesimal fast*, either because they came near the number of *forty days*, or because they were an appendix to the Paschal fast, which was most ancient, and originally called *Quadragesimal.*

[16] Discourse of Lent, pt. 1. ch. 3. (pp. 31, seqq.) Concerning the Fast before the Festival of the Resurrection.

[17] [Juxt. Ed. Stephan. Lutet. Paris. 1544. (fol. 55 verso, cap. 26.) ...Οἱ δὲ, τεσσαράκοντα ὥρας ἡμερινὰς καὶ νυκτερινὰς, συμμετροῦσι τὴν ἡμέραν αὐτῶν.—See also n. 11, preceding. Ed.]

[18] See n. 12, on the preceding page.

weeks, as the Constantinopolitans and neighbouring nations as far as Phœnicia; others fast three only of those six or seven weeks by intervals; others the three weeks next immediately before Easter, and others fast only two weeks, as the Montanists.'

Lent consisted not of above thirty-six fasting-days in any Church till the time of Gregory the Great, because all Sundays were universally excepted out of the fast, and all Saturdays except one in the Eastern Churches.

4. Cassian[21] has something of the same observation: for he says, 'some Churches kept their Lent six weeks, and some seven; and yet none of them made their fast above thirty-six days in the whole. For though six weeks be forty-two days, yet all Sundays were excepted out of the fast; and then six days being subducted, there remained but thirty-six days of fasting. In like manner those Churches which kept seven weeks, that is, forty-nine days to their Lent, excepted not only the Lord's-day, but all Saturdays save one, out of the number of fasting-days: and therefore thirteen days upon that account being subducted, the remainder was still but thirty-six.' And this was the whole of Lent till the time of Gregory the Great, who speaks of forty-two days[22] as the appointment of Lent, but taking away the Sundays the remainder is only thirty-six. Now that this was so is evident from what has been discoursed before[23] of the Lord's-day and the Sabbath, where I have fully shown that the Lord's-day was never allowed to be kept a fast, but always observed as a festival, even in Lent, in all Churches of the world; and in the Oriental Churches the Saturday or Sabbath was excepted out of the number of fast-days also. To what I have said before I shall only add here one passage of Chrysostom[24], where he gives

[21] Collat. 21. cc. 24, 25, &c. See afterwards, s. 6. n. 27, following.—Conf. Basil. Hom. 2. de Jejun. t. 1. p. 228. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 14.) Πέντε ἡμερῶν Νηστεία.—Hom. 14. cont. Ebrietat. p. 410. [al. In Ebriosos.] (ibid. p. 171.)

[22] Hom. 16. in Evang. t. 3. p. 42. [Ed. Bened. l. 1. in Evang. Hom. 16. n. 5.] (t. 1. p. 1494 e. 1.) Sex dies Dominici subtrahuntur, non plus in abstinentia quam triginta et sex dies remanent.

[23] B. 20. ch. 2. s. 5. p. 254, and ch. 3. s. 5. p. 272, of this volume.

[24] Hom. 11. in Gen. t. 2. p. 106. (t. 4. p. 84 a.) Καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς λεωφόροις εἰσὶ σταθμοὶ καὶ καταγώγια, ὥστε τοὺς ὁδίτας κεκμηκότας διαναπαύεσθαι, καὶ τῶν πόνων λήγοντας οὕτω πάλιν ἅπτεσθαι τῆς ὁδοιπορίας· καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ δὲ ἀκταὶ καὶ αἰγιαλοὶ καὶ λιμένες εἰσὶν, ὥστε κἀκεῖ τοὺς ναυτιλλομένους μετὰ τὰ πολλὰ κύματα διαδραμεῖν, καὶ πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἀνέμων ἐμβολὰς ἀντιστῆναι, μικρὸν ἀνεθέντας, οὕτω πάλιν τῆς ναυτιλίας ἅπτεσθαι. Τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς ἁγίας Τεσσαρακοστῆς, τοῖς τὸν δρόμον τῆς νηστείας καταδεξαμένοις, καθάπερ σταθμοὺς, καὶ καταγώγια, καὶ ἀκτὰς, καὶ αἰγιαλοὺς, καὶ λιμένας, τὰς δύο ταύτας ἡμέρας

the reason why this exception of these two days was made in the Lent fast. 'As there are stations,' says he, 'and inns in the public roads for weary travellers to refresh themselves and rest from their labours, that they may more cheerfully go on again in their journey: and as in the sea there are shores and havens for seamen to betake themselves to, when they are in a storm, and refresh themselves from the violence of the winds, and then begin sailing again; so the Lord hath appointed these two days in the week as stations, and inns, and shores, and havens, for those to rest in who have taken upon them the course of fasting in this holy time of Lent, that they may refresh their bodies a little from the labour of fasting, and recreate their minds, and, after these two days are past, go on again with cheerfulness in the journey which they have begun.' From hence it is apparent, that in some of the Eastern Churches, where the whole time of Lent was but six weeks or forty-two days, when the Saturdays and Sundays were deducted, the remainder of fasting-days were not above one-and-thirty; and where they were most, not above thirty-six [24].

Who first added Ash-Wednesday and the other three days in the Roman Church to the beginning of Lent.

5. Who first added Ash-Wednesday and the other three days to the beginning of Lent in the Roman Church, to make them completely forty, is not agreed among their own writers. Some say it was the work of Gregory the Great, but others ascribe it to Gregory the Second, who lived above an hundred years after, in the beginning of the eighth century. But, as Azorius [25] says, 'it is not very material whether of the two

τῆς ἑβδομάδος βραχύ τι διαναπαύεσθαι κεχάρισται ὁ Δεσπότης, ἵνα καὶ τὸ σῶμα μικρὸν ἀνέντες ἀπὸ τῶν πόνων τῆς νηστείας, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν παραμυθησάμενοι, πάλιν, παρελθουσῶν τῶν δύο τούτων ἡμερῶν, τῆς αὐτῆς ὁδοῦ μετὰ προθυμίας ἅπτωνται οἱ τὴν καλὴν ταύτην καὶ ἐπωφελῆ ὁδοιπορίαν ποιούμενοι.

[24] See Bishop Gunning, Discourse of Lent, p. 156. (Oxford, 1845. p. 117.) Hence it is from the Church's tenderness and condescension, &c.

[25] Institut. Moral. part. 1. l. 7. c. 12. (p. 657 d. 8.) [Secundo quæritur, Unde inchoetur jejunium Quadragenarium? Respondeo, Convenire apud omnes inde Quadragesimam inchoari a feria quarta cinerum, quæ vulgo appellatur *Quarta feria in capite jejunii*. Sic auctor Microlog. c. 49. Sed quæstionis est dubiæ an inceperit olim ante Gregorium Magnum in eadem feria quarta. Duæ sententiæ sunt, &c. — Conf. ibid. (p. 658 c.) Verisimile quidam existimant quatuor illos dies esse additos a Gregorio II., nam uterque [Greg. I. et Greg. II.] ecclesiastica officia ad certam rationem et methodum dicitur revocasse: sed parum refert, an Gregorius I. an potius II. eos quatuor dies adjecerit.—See also the whole of the intermediate context. Ed.]

was the author of the addition, since it is confessed to be an addition to Lent, after it had continued six hundred years without it.' And this is a plain demonstration that Lent, in this notion at least, as taken for the precise number of a forty days' fast, could not be of apostolical institution, whatever it might be in any other form or duration.

Whether the Ancients reputed Lent to be an apostolical institution.

6. But many of the Ancients do not allow it in any form to be an apostolical institution, but only an useful order and appointment of the Church. So Cassian[26] says expressly, 'that as long as the perfection of the primitive Church remained inviolable, there was no observation of Lent: but when men began to decline from the apostolical fervour of devotion, and give themselves overmuch to worldly affairs, then the priests in general agreed to recall them from secular cares by a canonical induction of fasting, and setting aside a tenth of their time for God.' For so he reckons[27], 'that the thirty-six days, which was then the fixed term of Lent, were by computation the tenth of the whole year.' Cassian was a disciple of St. Chrysostom, and he seems to have had

[26] Collat. 21. c. 30. (p. 573.) Sciendum sane hanc observantiam Quadragesimæ, quamdiu ecclesiæ illius primitivæ perfectio inviolata permansit, penitus non fuisse. Non enim præcepti hujus necessitate, nec quasi legali sanctione constricti, arctissimis jejuniorum terminis claudebantur, qui totum anni spatium æquali jejunio concludebant. Verum cum ab illa apostolica devotione descendens quotidie credentium multitudo suis opibus incubaret, nec eas usui cunctorum [fidelium] secundum Apostolorum instituta divideret, sed privatim impendiis suis consulens, non servare tantum, sed etiam augere contenderet, ... id tunc universis sacerdotibus placuit, ut homines curis sæcularibus illigatos et pene continentiæ vel compunctionis ignaros, ad opus sanctum canonica jejuniorum indictione revocarent, et velut legalium decimarum necessitate compellerent.

[27] C. 25. (p. 569.) Lege Mosaica universo populo generalis est promulgata præceptio, *Decimas tuas et primitias offeres Domino Deo tuo.* Itaque qui substantiarum nostrarum omniumque fructuum decimas offerre præcipimur, multo magis necesse est, ut ipsius quoque conversationis nostræ, et humani usus operumque nostrorum decimas offeramus, quæ profecto in supputatione Quadragesimæ evidenter implentur. Omnium enim dierum numerus, quibus revolutus in orbem annus includitur, triginta sex semis dierum numero decimatur. In septem vero hebdomadibus, si dies Dominici et Sabbata subtrahantur, quinque et triginta supersunt dies jejuniis deputati; sed adjecta illa vigiliarum die, qua usque in gallorum cantum, illucescente Dominica, jejunium Sabbati protelatur, non solum sex et triginta dierum numerus adimpletur, verum etiam pro decimis quinque dierum qui residui videbantur, si illud, quod superest, adjectum noctis spatium computetur, plenitudini totius summæ omnino nihil deerit.

his notion and sentiments about the original of Lent from him: for Chrysostom[28] gives much the same account of it: 'Why do we fast these forty days? Many heretofore were used to come to the communion indevoutly and inconsiderately, especially at this time, when Christ first gave it to his disciples: therefore our forefathers considering the mischief arising from such careless approaches, meeting together, appointed forty days for fasting and prayer, and hearing of sermons, and holy assemblies, that all men in these days being carefully purified by prayer, and almsdeeds, and fasting, and watching, and tears, and confession of sins, and other the like exercises, might come according to their capacity with a pure conscience to the holy table.'

St. Austin sometimes delivers himself after the same manner, though at other times he seems to derive the original of Lent from the authority of the Gospel. In one place[29] he says, 'Though fasting in general be prescribed in the New Testament, yet what days men ought to fast or what not, he finds not defined by any precept of Christ or his Apostles.' In another place[30], specifying more particularly the several solemnities observed by Christians, he says, 'There was some foundation and authority for them in Scripture: for we know out of the Gospel what day our Lord suffered and was buried,

[28] Hom. 52. In eos, qui primo Pascha jejunant. t. 5. p. 709. [Bened. Hom. cont. Judæos, 3.] (t. 1. p. 611 c.) *Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν νηστεύομέν, φησι, τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ταύτας ἡμέρας; Πολλοὶ τὸ παλαιὸν τοῖς μυστηρίοις προσήεσαν ἁπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε, καὶ μάλιστα κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον, καθ' ὃν ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτὰ παρέδωκε. Συνειδότες οὖν οἱ πατέρες τὴν βλάβην τὴν γινομένην ἐκ τῆς ἠμελημένης προσόδου, συνελθόντες ἐτύπωσαν ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα νηστείας, εὐχῶν, ἀκροάσεως, συνόδων, ἵν' ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις καθαρθέντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἅπαντες καὶ δι' εὐχῶν, καὶ δι' ἐλεημοσύνης, καὶ διὰ νηστείας, καὶ διὰ παννυχίδων, καὶ διὰ δακρύων, καὶ δι' ἐξομολογήσεως, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἁπάντων, οὕτω κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἡμετέραν μετὰ καθαροῦ συνειδότος προσίωμεν.*

[29] Ep. 86. [al. 36.] ad Casulan. c. 11. p. 147. (t. 2. p. 78 b.) Ego in evangelicis et apostolicis literis totoque instrumento, quod appellatur Testamentum Novum, animo id revolvens, video præceptum esse jejunium. Quibus autem diebus non oporteat jejunare, et quibus oporteat, præcepto Domini vel Apostolorum non invenio definitum.

[30] Ep. 119. [al. 55.] ad Januar. c. 15. (t. 2. p. 139 a.) . . . . Ex Evangelio tamen quia [jam] manifestum est quo etiam die Dominus crucifixus sit, et in sepultura fuerit, et resurrexerit, adjuncta est etiam ipsorum dierum observatio per patrum concilia, et orbi universo Christiano persuasum est eo modo Pascha celebrari oportere. Quadragesima sane jejuniorum habet auctoritatem et in veteribus libris ex jejunio Moysi et Eliæ, et ex Evangelio, quia totidem diebus Dominus jejunavit.

and rose again from the dead, and therefore the observation of these days was added by the councils of the Fathers, and the whole world was persuaded to celebrate the Pasch after that manner. The forty days' fast has authority both in the Old Testament from the fast of Moses and Elias, and also from the Gospel, because our Lord fasted so many days.' He adds a little after[31], 'that the supputation of Easter and fifty days of Pentecost are firmly collected out of Scripture. For as the custom of the Church has confirmed the observation of these forty days before Easter, so has it also confirmed the distinction that is made between the eight days of neophytes (or the time of the newly baptized wearing their white garments) from the rest, that the eighth day might accord with the first.' Here are two things very observable in St. Austin's words. First, that the authority and foundation, which the Lent fast has out of the Gospel, is the same that it has out of the Old Testament, which was not any precept, but the example of Moses and Elias. Secondly, that the Lent fast is owing to the Councils of the Fathers and the custom of the Church, in like manner as the eight days of the neophytes and the fifty days of Pentecost owe their observation to the same original; concerning which no one doubts, but that though there may be remotely some foundation for them in Scripture, yet there is no express command, but that they owe their original purely to the councils of the Fathers and the custom of the Church.

at some m say divine ution.

7. Now by this we understand what others of the Ancients mean, when they say the forty days' fast is a divine institution, and derived from the authority of Scripture. As St. Jerom says[32], 'Moses and Elias fasting forty days were filled with the conversation of God; and our Lord himself fasted so many days in the wilderness, that he might leave to us the solemn days of fasting.' And again[33], 'Our Lord, the true Jonas,

[31] Ibid. c. 17. (p. 141 d.) Hæc de Scripturis firmissime tenentur, id est, Pascha et Pentecostes. Nam ut quadraginta illi dies ante Pascha observentur, ecclesiæ consuetudo roboravit; sic etiam ut octo dies neophytorum distinguantur a cæteris, id est, ut octavus primo concinat.

[32] In Isai. 58. p. 262. (t. 4. p. 688 a.) Elias ac Moyses, quadraginta dierum esurie, Dei familiaritate saturati sunt, et ipse Dominus totidem diebus in solitudine jejunavit, ut nobis solemnes jejuniorum dies relinqueret.

[33] In Jonæ c. 3. (t. 6. p. 416 d.)

being sent to preach in the world, fasted forty days, and leaving us the inheritance of fasting under this number he prepares our souls for the eating of his body.' Besides, many the like expressions occur in the writings of St. Basil[34], Theophilus[35], Cyril of Alexandria[36], Petrus Chrysologus[37], and several others, which Bishop Beveridge has put together upon this occasion [in his treatise *De Jejunio Quadragesimali*]. But none of these intended to say that there is any direct and express divine command for it, but only some precedent or example in the extraordinary practice of the forty days' fast of our Saviour, or those of Moses and Elias: which is not enough to ground a precept upon, because such extraordinary examples are not imitable, neither can they be reduced to practice but in a much lower way, which may warrant the Church to appoint a fast of forty days, but not to impose it as a matter of divine command. Chrysostom[38] among the Ancients saw this

Ipse Dominus, verus Jona, missus ad prædicationem mundi, jejunat quadraginta dies; et hæreditatem nobis jejunii derelinquens, ad esum corporis sui sub hoc numero nostras animas præparat.

[34] Hom. 2. de Jejun. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 15 c. n. 2.) *Εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην περιαγγέλλεται τὸ κήρυγμα· καὶ οὔτέ τις νῆσος, οὐκ ἤπειρος, οὐ πόλις, οὐκ ἔθνος, οὐκ ἐσχατιὰ ἀνήκοός ἐστι τοῦ κηρύγματος· ἀλλὰ καὶ στρατόπεδα, καὶ ὁδοιπόροι, καὶ πλωτῆρες, καὶ ἔμποροι, πάντες ὁμοίως καὶ ἀκούουσι τοῦ παραγγέλματος, καὶ περιχαρῶς ὑποδέχονται. Ὥστε μηδεὶς ἑαυτὸν ἔξω ποιείτω τοῦ καταλόγου τῶν νηστευόντων, ἐν ᾧ πάντα γένη καὶ πᾶσα ἡλικία καὶ ἀξιωμάτων διαφοραὶ πᾶσαι καταλέγονται. . . . Πλούσιος εἶ; μὴ καθυβρίσῃς τὴν νηστείαν . . . μή ποτέ σε καταγγείλῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ νομοθέτου τῶν νηστειῶν.*

[35] Ep. Paschal. ap. Bevereg. de Jejunio Quadragesimali, c. 8. s. 5. (ap. Cotel. t. 2. part. 2. p. 165.) Iisdem feriediebus, [quibus Basilius scripsit,] Theophilus Alexandrinus tres suas Paschales Epistolas, quas S. Hieronymus æqualis ejus Latinas fecit, et in lucem edidit; in quibus passim asserit, jejunium hoc quadragesimale secundum evangelicas et apostolicas traditiones observandum esse.

[36] Hom. Paschal. passim. [Vid. Bevereg. l. c. (ibid. postea.) Et exiguo post eum tempore, Cyrillus, Alexandrinæ itidem ecclesiæ antistes, in Paschalibus Homiliis a se conscriptis sæpe inculcat, hoc jejunium ab omnibus celebrandum esse *κατὰ τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παραδόσεις*, et nonnunquam *κατὰ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν παράδοσιν*. Ed.]

[37] Serm. 11. ap. Bevereg. l. c. ibid. antea. (Oper. Chrysol. p. 19.) Videtis, fratres, quia quod Quadragesimam jejunamus, non est humana inventio; auctoritas est divina: et est mysticum, non præsumptum; nec est de terreno usu, sed de cœlestibus est secretis.—Serm. 166. (Chrysol. p. 232.) Si ergo quadraginta dierum simplex, purum, æquale tantis testimoniis sub tanti numero sacramenti traditum nobis a Domino jejunium perdocetur; unde ista varietas, unde novitas ista, unde hebdomadæ nunc resolutæ, nunc rigidæ, nunc indulgentes, nimium nunc severæ?

[38] Hom. 47. in Matth. p. 425. [Bened. 46. al. 47.] (t. 7. p. 486 a.) *Μάθετε γάρ, φησιν, ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πρᾷός εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅτι Ἐνήστευσα. Καί τοί γε εἶχεν εἰπεῖν τὰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ἀλλ' οὐ λέγει τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ὅτι Πρᾷός*

very clearly, and therefore he says, 'Christ did not say to his disciples, I have fasted, although he might have spoken of those forty days: but, "Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart:" and when he sent them to preach the Gospel he did not tell them they should fast, but "eat such things as were set before them." This I speak not,' says he, 'to depreciate fasting, God forbid! but to give it extraordinary commendations. Only I am sorry ye should think this, which is in the lowest rank of virtues, sufficient to salvation, whilst other things of greater value, charity, humility, mercy, which exceed even virginity itself, are wholly neglected.' By this it is plain, they did not think the example of Christ sufficient to authorize the imposition of a forty days' fast as a matter of divine injunction.

How far allowed to be a tradition or canon apostolical.

8. But it must be owned, some of them call it a *tradition*, or *canon apostolical.* St. Jerom[39] says, 'We observe one Lent in the year, according to the tradition of the Apostles.' Pope Leo[40] calls it 'the apostolical institution of a forty days' fast, which the Apostles instituted by the direction of the Holy Ghost.' But it is no small diminution to the judgment of Pope Leo, that Mr. Pagi[41] and Quesnel[42] observe of him, 'that he was used to call every thing an apostolical law which he found

εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ. Καὶ πάλιν, πέμπων αὐτοὺς, οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅτι Νηστεύετε· ἀλλὰ, Πᾶν τὸ παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε.... Ταῦτα δὲ λέγω, οὐχὶ νηστείαν κακίζων· μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα ἐπαινῶν· ἀλγῶ δὲ, ὅταν τῶν ἄλλων ἠμελημένων ταύτην νομίζητε ἀρκεῖν εἰς σωτηρίαν ὑμῖν, τὸ ἔσχατον τοῦ χοροῦ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔχουσαν μέρος· τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον, ἀγάπη, καὶ ἐπιείκεια, καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη, ἣ καὶ παρθενίαν ὑπερηκόντισεν.

[39] Ep. 54. [al. 41.] ad Marcellam. (t. 1. p. 187 a.) Nos unam Quadragesimam, secundum traditionem Apostolorum, toto nobis orbe congruo, jejunamus. Illi [Montanistæ] tres in anno faciunt Quadragesimas, quasi tres passi sint Salvatores, &c.

[40] Serm. 6. de Quadragesima [al. 44. c. 2.] (t. 1. p. 168.) Quod ergo, dilectissimi, in omni tempore unumquemque facere convenit Christianum, id nunc solicitius et devotius est exequendum, ut apostolica institutio quadraginta dierum jejuniis impleatur.—It. Serm. 9. [al. 48. c. 1.] (ibid. p. 177.) In quibus merito a sanctis Apostolis per doctrinam Spiritus Sancti majora sunt instituta jejunia, ut per commune consortium crucis Christi, etiam nos aliquid in eo, quod propter nos gessit, agueremus.

[41] Crit. in Baron. an. 67. s. 15. [al. 19.] (t. 1. p. 57.) Familiare itaque est Leoni, ut cum de apostolica traditione sermonem habet, de ea loquatur, quam ab Apostolo Petro ecclesiæ Romanæ relictam putabat. Ea vero ex B. Petri traditione descendere existimavit, quæ et olim observata, et decretis sancita inveniebat eorum ecclesiæ suæ pontificum, quorum monumenta supererant illa ætate.

[42] In Leon. l. c.—See also the preceding note.

either in the practice of his own Church, or decreed in the archives of his predecessors, Damasus and Siricius.' And for St. Jerom, he himself tells us that he sometimes calls particular customs of Churches by the name of *apostolical traditions:* for, writing about the Sabbath, which some Churches kept a fast, and others a festival, he says[43], 'Every country may abound in their own sense, and take the precepts of their ancestors for apostolical laws.' And if St. Jerom did so here, we may easily apprehend his meaning: if he did otherwise, he was certainly mistaken: since it appears from the premises that the apostolical Lent was much short of the Lent St. Jerom speaks of, and increased to the number of forty days by various steps and gradations.

The apostolical Lent was only a fast of a few days before Easter: by the time of Dionysius of Alexandria, it was come to be a whole week, and perhaps somewhat more, anno 250. At Rome, about the same time, as a very learned person[44] thinks, who has written very accurately upon this subject, it was three weeks, in the time when Cornelius and Novatian were contending about the bishopric of Rome: which made the followers of Novatian stick to that term in the times of Socrates, when Lent was improved to six weeks in Rome. From three weeks that learned person thinks it was first advanced to six, either by the Council of Nice in its fifth canon, or not long before it. And then it began commonly to be called *Quadragesima*, or *the Forty days' Fast*, because, though in strictness the fasting days were but thirty-six, or thirty-one, yet the first of them was at least *forty days* before Easter, and that gave denomination to the whole. And thus it was in the time of St. Jerom: but it is a wrong conclusion in him, that because there was an apostolical fast of some few days before Easter, which afterwards improved by various degrees into a fast of forty days, therefore the fast of forty days must

[43] Ep. 28. [al. 71.] ad Lucin. Bœtic. (t. 1. p. 433 a.)... Unaquæque provincia abundet in sensu suo, et præcepta majorum leges apostolicas arbitretur.

[44] Bishop Hooper: Discourse of Lent, part. 1. ch. 10. (p. 139.) And so, if we suppose, &c.—Ibid. ch. 5. (p. 84.) To which I may add, &c.—See the last clause of C. Nicæn. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 316.) where the word Τεσσαρακοστή occurs in the direction for provincial synods to be held, one before *Quadragesima*, and another in Autumn. Ed.]

needs be of apostolical institution: and it is more insufferable in those, who, after four other days were added to thirty-six to make them precisely forty days of fasting, still pretend it is the very same Lent that was originally settled in the Church by the Apostles. The matter in itself is not great, but the prejudice and confidence of men in managing a dispute is wonderful, when they will maintain a paradox, that may with such glaring evidence be so easily confuted. For as Bishop Taylor[45] says very well upon the point, 'If any man should say that kings were all created as Adam was, in full stature and manhood by God himself immediately, he could best be confuted by the midwives and the nurses, the schoolmasters, and the servants of the family, and by all the neighbourhood, who saw them born infants, who took them from their mothers' knees, who gave them suck, who carried them in their arms, who made them coats, and taught them their letters, who observed their growth, and changed their ministeries about their persons. The same is the case of the present article. He that says our Lent, or forty days' fast before Easter, was established by the Apostles in that full growth and state we now see it, is perfectly confuted by the testimony of those ages that saw its infancy and childhood, and helped to nurse it up to its present bulk.' And with this I shall end the present inquiry about the original and progress of Lent in the first ages of the Church.

What were the causes or reasons for instituting the Lent fast. First, the Apostles' sorrow for the loss of their Master.

9. The next inquiry may be into the causes and reasons of its institution. And here, first of all, if we respect the original institution, the reason is given by Tertullian, who makes the Catholics say, as we have heard before[45], that the reason of the Apostles fasting at this time was, because the bridegroom was taken away from them. In compliance with which practice the Ancients generally observed those two days, in which our Saviour lay in the grave, with the greatest strictness, as we shall see more hereafter. Though the Montanists, who pretended to the Spirit of prophecy, understood 'the taking away of the bridegroom' in another sense, for our Saviour's ascension or assumption into heaven: and therefore they kept one of their Lents or fasts (for they had three in the year)

[45] Ductor Dubitantium, b. 3. ch. 4. p. 632. (rule 13. s. 14. Works, v. 14. p. 38.) If any man should say, &c.

[45] See s. 2. n. 9, preceding.

after our Lord's ascension, in opposition to the Church, which celebrated the whole time of Pentecost as a solemn festival. This we learn from St. Jerom[46], who not only says, the Montanists kept three Lents in the year, but also that they kept one of them after Ascension[47], pretending to know by their new inspiration, that that was the time which our Saviour meant, when he said, "the Bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." So both the Catholics and the Montanists agreed upon the reason of a fast, though they applied it to a different time according to their different apprehensions.

Secondly, the declension of Christian piety from its first and primitive fervour.

10. Cassian[48] gives another reason for the institution of Lent: he says, 'At first there was no observation of Lent, as long as the perfection of the primitive Church remained inviolable: for they, who fasted as it were all the year round, were not tied up by the necessity of this precept, nor confined within the strait bonds of such a fast, as by a legal sanction: but when the multitude of believers began to depart from that apostolical devotion, and brood continually upon their riches; when instead of imparting them to the common use of all, they laboured only to lay them up and augment them for their own private expenses, not content to follow the example of Ananias and Sapphira; then it seemed good to all the bishops by a canonical induction of fasts to recall men to holy works, who were bound with secular cares, and had almost forgotten what continency and compunction meant, and to compel them by the necessity of a law to dedicate the tenth of their time to God.' To the same purpose Pope Leo[49] says, 'Whilst men

[46] Ep. 54. [al. 41.] ad Marcellam. See n. 39, preceding.

[47] In Matth. 9. (t. 7. p. 51 c.) Sponsus, Christus: sponsa ecclesia est. De hoc sancto spiritualique connubio Apostoli sunt procreati: qui lugere non possunt, quamdiu sponsam in thalamo vident, et sciunt sponsum esse cum sponsa. Quando vero transierint nuptiæ, et passionis ac resurrectionis tempus advenerit, tunc sponsi filii jejunabunt. Nonnulli putant, idcirco post dies quadraginta passionis jejunia debere committi: licet statim dies Pentecostes, et Spiritus Sanctus adveniens, indicant nobis festivitatem. Et ex hujus occasione testimonii, Montanus, Prisca, et Maximilla, etiam post Pentecosten faciunt Quadragesimam: quod, ablato sponso, filii sponsi debeant jejunare.

[48] Collat. 21. c. 30. See before, s. 6. n. 26, preceding.

[49] Serm. 4. [al. 42. c. 1.] de Quadragesima. (t. 1. p. 156.) Quamvis enim nulla sint tempora, quæ divinis non sint plena muneribus, et semper nobis ad misericordiam Dei per ipsius gratiam præstetur accessus; nunc tamen omnium mentes majori studio ad spiritales profectus moveri,

are distracted about the various cares of this life, their religious hearts must needs be defiled with the dust of this world: and therefore it is provided by the great benefit of this divine institution, that the purity of our minds might be repaired by the exercise of these forty days, in which we may redeem the failings of other times, and do good works, and exercise ourselves in religious fasting.'

Thirdly, that men might prepare themselves for a worthy participation of the communion at Easter.

11. A third reason was, that men might prepare their souls for a worthy participation of the communion at Easter. For though men at first were used to communicate every Lord's-day, and to keep themselves continually in a constant, habitual preparation for that holy mystery; yet as the primitive spirit of Christianity declined, men came by degrees to communicate chiefly at Easter, and some at no other time but that only. For the sake of these men therefore the observation of the preceding fast was much urged, that by proper and spiritual exercises, they might be duly prepared to receive the communion at Easter, who could not be prevailed upon to frequent it at other seasons. This is what we have heard St. Chrysostom[50] say before, 'that because men were used to come indevoutly and inconsiderately to the communion, especially at Easter, when Christ first instituted the holy Supper, therefore the Fathers, considering the mischiefs arising from such careless approaches, met together, and appointed forty days for fasting, that in these days men being carefully purified by prayer, and almsdeeds, and fasting, and watching, and tears, and confession of sins, and other the like exercises, might come with a pure conscience to the holy table.' To the same purpose in another place[51]: 'As they that take great pains to

et ampliori fiducia oportet animari, quando ad universa pietatis officia illius nos diei, in quo redempti sumus, recursus invitat: ut excellens super omnia passionis Dominicæ sacramentum, purificatis et corporibus et animis, celebremus. Debebatur quidem tantis mysteriis ita incessabilis devotio et continuata reverentia, ut tales permaneremus in conspectu Dei, quales nos in ipso Paschali festo dignum est inveniri. Sed quia hæc fortitudo paucorum est, et dum carnis fragilitate austerior observantia relaxatur, dumque per varias actiones vitæ hujus solicitudo distenditur, necesse est de mundano pulvere etiam gloriosa corda sordescere: magna divinæ institutionis salubritate provisum est, ut ad reparandam mentium puritatem quadraginta nobis dierum exercitatio mederetur, in quibus aliorum temporum culpas, et pia opera redimerent, et jejunia casta decoquerent.

[50] Hom. 52. In eos, qui primo Pascha jejunant. t. 5. p. 709. See before, s. 6. n. 28, preceding.

[51] Hom. 22. de Ira. t. 1. p. 276. [Bened. ad Pop. Antioch. Hom. 20.]

run in a race reap no advantage, if they fail of the prize; so we have no benefit from all the labour and pains we bestow upon fasting, unless we can come with a pure conscience to partake of the holy table. For this end we use fasting and Lent, and assemblies for so many days together, and hearing, and praying, and preaching, that by our diligence in the use of these means, and regard to the divine commands, we may wipe off the sins of the whole year that stick to us, and so with spiritual boldness and reverence partake of the unbloody sacrifice.' The like is said by St. Jerom[52], 'that our Lord fasting forty days, and leaving us the inheritance of fasting under this number, prepares our souls for the eating of his body.' And this I take to have been the principal cause of the Church's enlarging her Lent to the length of forty days, as occasion required, from such small beginnings, as it seems to have had in its first original.

Fourthly, that catechumens might prepare themselves for baptism.

12. Besides these general reasons for the observation of Lent, there were two particular reasons more peculiarly respecting two orders of men in the Church, viz. the catechumens who were preparing for baptism, and the penitents who were preparing for absolution. It has been noted elsewhere[53], that Easter was the fixed and solemn time both for admitting catechumens to baptism, and readmitting penitents, after lapsing and peforming a solemn penance, into the communion of the Church again: and solemn fasting was preparatory to each of these. Justin Martyr[54] speaks of a general fast of the

(t. 2. p. 199 a.) *Ὥσπερ γὰρ οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῶν πολλῶν διαύλων τοῖς τρέχουσιν, ἂν τῶν βραβείων ἐκπέσωσιν· οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡμῖν ἔσται τι κέρδος ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν πόνων καὶ ἱδρώτων, τῶν περὶ τὴν νηστείαν, ἐὰν μὴ μετὰ καθαροῦ συνειδότος δυνηθῶμεν τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀπολαῦσαι τραπέζης. Διὰ τοῦτο νηστεία καὶ Τεσσαρακοστὴ, καὶ τοσούτων ἡμερῶν σύναξις, καὶ ἀκρόασις, καὶ εὐχαὶ, καὶ διδασκαλίαι, ἵνα παντὶ τρόπῳ τὰ παρὰ πάντα τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἡμῖν ἁμαρτήματα προστριβέντα διὰ τῆς σπουδῆς ταύτης τῶν θεϊκῶν ἐνταλμάτων ἀποσμηξάμενοι, μετὰ παρρησίας πνευματικῆς μετάσχωμεν εὐλαβῶς τῆς ἀναιμάκτου ἐκείνης θυσίας.*

[52] In Jonæ, c. 3. (t. 6. p. 416 d.) Ipse Dominus verus Jona, missus ad prædicationem mundi, jejunat quadraginta dies: et, hæreditatem nobis jejunii derelinquens, ad esum corporis sui sub hoc numero nostras animas præparat.

[53] B. 11. ch. 6. s. 7. v. 4. p. 105.

[54] Apol. 2. (p. 93 e.) *Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν, ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὔχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστι, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται.*

whole Church together with the catechumens, who presented themselves to baptism: 'As many,' says he, 'as are persuaded, and do believe that the things taught and said by us are true, and promise to live accordingly, they are instructed to pray, and with fasting to beg of God remission of sins, we praying and fasting together with them. Then they are brought to the place where water is, and are regenerated after the same manner of regeneration as we were regenerated before them.' This is a plain account of a public fast before baptism. Afterward when the time of baptism was settled to Easter, it is certain the Lent fast was observed by the catechumens, as preparatory to their baptism. For Cyril of Jerusalem[55] thus addresses himself to the catechumens: 'The present season is a season of confession: all worldly cares are to be laid aside; for you strive for your souls. You that have been busy about the things of the world, and troubled in vain so many years, will ye not bestow forty days in prayer for the salvation of your souls?' So again[56]: 'There is a large time given you: you have the penance before you of forty days, sufficient space and opportunity to put off the old garments, and put on new.' Upon this account all candidates of baptism were obliged to give in their names forty days before baptism, which Cyril[57] calls *ὀνοματογραφία, the entering of their names*, in the same place. This is intimated by the fourth Council of Carthage, which orders[58], 'that they, who are to receive baptism, shall give in their names, and continue a long time under abstinence from wine and flesh, and use imposition of hands, and frequent examination.' The time of forty days is not particularly specified here, but it is plainly expressed in one of the canons of Siricius[59], who speaks of giving baptism at Easter 'only to

[55] Catech. 1. n. 5. (p. 18 c.) Καιρὸς ἐξομολογήσεως ὁ παρών. . . . . Πᾶσαν μέριμναν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐξάλειψον ἀπό σου, περὶ ψυχῆς γὰρ τρέχεις. . . . . Τοσούτους κύκλους ἐνιαυτῶν διῆλθες περὶ τὸν κόσμον μάτην ἀσχολούμενος, καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας οὐ σχολάζεις τῇ προσευχῇ διὰ τὴν σαυτοῦ ψυχήν.

[56] In Præfat. n. 3. [al. 4.] (p. 5 a.) Πολλή σοι ἡ προθεσμία· τεσσαράκοντα ἡμερῶν· μετάνοιαν ἔχεις· ἔχεις πολλὴν εὐκαιρίαν, καὶ ἐκδύσασθαι, καὶ ἀποπλύνασθαι, καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν.

[57] Ibid. n. 1. (p. 2 a.) Ὀνοματογραφία τέως ὑμῖν γέγονε, καὶ στρατείας κλῆσις.—N. 3. [al. 4.] (p. 4 b.) Ὄνομά σου ἐνεγράφη, κ. τ. λ.

[58] C. 85. (t. 2. p. 1206 e.) Baptizandi nomen suum dent, et diu [sub] abstinentia vini et carnium, ac manus impositione, crebra examinatione [al. examinati], baptismum percipiant.

[59] Ep. 1. ad Himer. c. 2. (ibid. p. 1018 c.) . . . . Generalia baptismatis tradi convenit sacramenta his dun-

such as gave in their names forty days before and continued under the daily discipline of exorcism, prayer and fasting.' Which shows that this fast of forty days was then a time more peculiarly observed by such catechumens as were preparing for baptism at Easter following.

And penitents for absolution at Easter.

13. The like discipline was observed toward penitents who, after their canonical penance was completed, were generally absolved about the time of the Paschal festival: and therefore it is reasonable to suppose that the preceding time of Lent was always more strictly observed by them, as a decent preparation for the absolution they then expected. Not that this was the only time of penance, especially for great and scandalous criminals; for many of these were kept under penance for many years successively, as has been shown in a former Book: but the ordinary time of absolving them was Easter; as we learn not only from the testimony of St. Ambrose[60] and others, alleged heretofore[61] in the discourse of absolution, but from Gregory Nyssen, who says[62], 'the anniversary solemnity of Easter was not only the time of regenerating catechumens, but of begetting those again to a lively hope, who had forfeited it by their sin, but were desirous to regain it by repentance and conversion from dead works, to walk again in the paths of life.' The same is intimated in the canons of the Council of Ancyra[63], and those of Peter of Alexandria[64], and the Epistles

taxat electis, qui ante quadraginta vel eo amplius dies nomen dederint, et exorcismis, quotidianisque orationibus atque jejuniis fuerint expiati.

[60] Ep. 33. [al. 20.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 859 b. n. 26.) Erat dies, quo sese Dominus pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia pœnitentia relaxatur.

[61] B. 19. ch. 2. s. 10. p. 208.

[62] Ep. Canonic. ad Letoium, in Præfat. t. 2. p. 114. (CC. t. 2. p. 1776 e.) Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ καθολικὴ καὶ αὕτη τῆς κτίσεως ἑορτὴ κατὰ τὴν τεταγμένην περίοδον τοῦ ἐνιαυσιαίου κύκλου καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος, ἐν παντὶ πληρουμένη τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τοῦ πεπτωκότος ἐπιτελεῖται· πτῶσις δέ ἐστιν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἀνάστασις δὲ ἡ ἐκ τοῦ πτώματος τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀνόρθωσις. Καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην, οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἐκ παλιγγενεσίας μεταστοιχειουμένους, διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ χάριτος τῷ Θεῷ προσάγειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς διὰ τῆς μετανοίας τε καὶ ἐπιστροφῆς ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὴν ζῶσαν ὁδὸν πάλιν ἐπανιόντας, καὶ τούτους χειραγωγεῖν πρὸς τὴν σώζουσαν ἐλπίδα, ἧς διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπεξενώθησαν.

[63] C. 6. (t. 1. p. 1457 e.) Περὶ τῶν ἀπειλῇ μόνον εἰξάντων κολάσεως, καὶ ἀφαιρέσεως ὑπαρχόντων ἢ μετοικίας, καὶ θυσάντων, καὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καιροῦ μὴ μετανοησάντων, μηδὲ ἐπιστρεψάντων, νῦν δὲ παρὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς συνόδου προσελθόντων, καὶ εἰς διάνοιαν τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς γενομένων· ἔδοξε μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας εἰς ἀκρόασιν δεχθῆναι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν μεγάλην ἡμέραν ὑποπεσεῖν τρία ἔτη, καὶ μετὰ ἄλλα δύο ἔτη κοινωνῆσαι χωρὶς προσφορᾶς, καὶ οὕτως ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον, ὥστε τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξαετίαν

of Cyprian[65], all of which speak of Easter as the great and solemn time of admitting penitents, as a learned prelate[66] of our Church has with great judgment and acuteness observed out of them. And thence we may infer, that penitents, who were bound to strict rules of penance all the year round, and many times year after year under a long course of discipline, were more exactly careful in the observation of this season, in hopes of obtaining their absolution in the close of it. Whence St. Jerom[67] observes, 'that forty was a number proper for penitents, and fasting, and sackcloth, and tears, and perseverance in deprecating God's anger. For which reason Moses also fasted forty days in Mount Sinai; and Elias, flying from

πληρῶσαι. Εἰ δέ τινες πρὸ τῆς συνόδου ταύτης ἐδέχθησαν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ χρόνου λελογίσθαι αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ἑξαετίας· εἰ μέν τοι κίνδυνος καὶ θανάτου προσδοκία ἐκ νόσου ἢ ἄλλης τινὸς προφάσεως συμβαίη, τούτους ἐπὶ ὅρῳ δεχθῆναι.

[64] C. 4. (ibid. p. 956 a.) Ἐπεὶ τοίνυν τέταρτον ἤδη Πάσχα ἐπικατείληφε τὸν διωγμὸν, αὐτάρκως ἔχει τοῖς μὲν προσενεχθεῖσι καὶ φυλακισθεῖσι, βασάνους τε ἀνυποίστους ὑπομεμηνκόσι καὶ ἀφορήτους μάστιγας καὶ πολλὰς ἑτέρας ἀνάγκας δεινὰς, ὕστερον δὲ προδιδομένοις ὑπὸ τῆς ἀσθενείας τῆς σαρκὸς, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρεδέχθησαν διὰ τὴν παρακολουθήσασαν μεγίστην πτῶσιν, ὁμῶς διὰ τὸ πολλὰ αὐτοὺς ἠθληκέναι καὶ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀντιμάχεσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἐν τούτῳ ἐληλύθασιν, ἀλλὰ καταπροδοθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἀσθενείας τῆς σαρκός. Ἐπειδὴ καὶ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐνδείκνυνται ἐν τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἤδη τινὲς τρίτον ἔτος ἔχουσι καταπενθοῦντες· προσεπιτιμηθῆναι αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς προσελεύσεως καθ' ὑπόμνησιν, ἄλλας τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ἃς καίπερ νηστεύσας ὁ Κύριος καὶ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, μετὰ τὸ βαπτισθῆναι, ἐπειράσθη ἀπὸ τοῦ Διαβόλου· εἰς ἃς καὶ αὐτοὶ κατὰ τὸ περισσὸν διαγυμνασθέντες, ἐντονώτερόν τε νήψαντες, γρηγορήσουσιν εἰς προσευχὰς τοῦ λοιποῦ, καταμελετῶντες τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς τὸν πειράζοντα αὐτὸν, ἵνα προσκυνήσῃ αὐτῷ, Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μοῦ Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γὰρ, Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

[65] Ep. 56. Edit. Oxon. [al. 53.] (p. 251.) Quoniam tamen scripsistis, ut cum pluribus collegis de hoc ipso plenissime tractem, et res tanta exigit majus et impensius de multorum collatione consilium, et nunc omnes fere, inter Paschæ prima solemnia, apud se cum fratribus demorantur; quando solemnitati celebrandæ apud suos satisfecerint, et ad me venire cœperint, tractabo cum singulis plenius, &c.

[66] Bishop Hooper: Discourse of Lent, part 1. ch. 6. (p. 93.) We may justly suppose St. Cyprian was consulted before Easter about the same case, the reconciliation of those who had been penitents three years; that, if he answered favourably, they might have been admitted at the approaching festival, &c.

[67] In Jonæ, c. 3. (t. 6. p. 416 c.) Quadragenarius numerus convenit peccatoribus, et jejunio, et orationi, et sacco, et lacrymis, et perseverantiæ deprecandi: ob quod et Moyses quadraginta diebus jejunavit in Monte Sina, et Elias fugiens Jezabel, indicta fame terræ Israel, et Dei desuper ira pendente, quadraginta dies jejunasse describitur. Ipse quoque Dominus, verus Jona, missus ad prædicationem mundi, jejunat quadraginta dies: et, hæreditatem nobis jejunii derelinquens, ad esum corporis sui sub hoc numero nostras animas præparat.

Jezebel, and the wrath of God impending upon Israel, is described as fasting forty days. Our Lord also himself, the true Jonas, who was sent to preach to the world, fasted forty days; and leaving us the inheritance of his fasting, he still prepares our souls for the eating of his body by the same number.'

Lent generally observed by all Christians, though with a great liberty and just allowance to men's infirmities, being in a great measure left to their own discretion.

14. Thus we see catechumens and public penitents were strictly obliged to the observation of Lent, as part of their discipline and preparation for baptism and absolution. Nor was the great body of the Church backward at this season to concur in fasting and prayer with them. For St. Chrysostom[68] says, 'Though at other times when we preachers cry up and preach the duty of fasting never so much all the year, scarce any one hearkens to what we say; yet when the season of forty days is come, though none exhort or advise them, the most negligent set themselves to it, taking admonition and advice from the very season.' Lent, it seems, was then generally reputed a proper time to fast, and repent, and mourn for sin, that such as were negligent at other times might take this opportunity to recollect and humble themselves, and come duly prepared to the communion at the Easter festival. Therefore he adds immediately, 'If a Jew or a Heathen ask you why you fast; do not tell him it is for our Saviour's passion or the cross: for so you will give him an handle to accuse you: for we do not fast for the passion or the cross, but for our sins, because we are come to the holy mysteries. The passion is not the occasion of fasting or mourning, but of joy and exultation: we mourn not for that, but for our sins, and therefore

[68] Hom. 52. In eos, qui Pascha jejunant. t. 5. p. 709. [Bened. Hom. cont. Jud. 3.] (t. 1. p. 611 d.) Ἡμεῖς μὲν ἂν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ μένωμεν βοῶντες καὶ κηρύττοντες νηστείαν, οὐδεὶς προσέχει τοῖς λεγομένοις· ἂν δὲ ἐπιστῇ μόνον ὁ τῆς Τεσσαρακοστῆς καιρὸς, καὶ μηδενὸς παραινοῦντος, μηδὲ συμβουλεύοντος, καὶ ὁ σφόδρα νωθρότατος διανίσταται, τὴν παρὰ τοῦ καιροῦ λαμβάνων συμβουλὴν καὶ παραίνεσιν. Ἂν οὖν ἔρηταί σε Ἰουδαῖος καὶ Ἕλλην, τίνος ἕνεκεν νηστεύεις; μὴ εἴπῃς, ὅτι διὰ τὸ Πάσχα, μηδὲ ὅτι διὰ τὸν σταυρὸν, ἐπεὶ πολλὴν αὐτῷ δίδως τὴν λαβήν· οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὸ Πάσχα νηστεύομεν, οὐδὲ διὰ τὸν σταυρὸν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τὰ ἡμέτερα, ἐπειδὴ μέλλομεν μυστηρίοις προσιέναι· ἐπεὶ τόγε Πάσχα οὐ νηστείας ἐστὶν, οὐδὲ πένθους, ἀλλ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ χαρᾶς ὑπόθεσις. . . . Οὐ γὰρ πενθοῦμεν δι' ἐκεῖνον [*nempe* σταυρὸν], μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἁμαρτήματα· διὰ τοῦτο νηστεύομεν. . . . Ἂν μετὰ καθαροῦ προσέλθῃ συνειδότος, Πάσχα ἐπιτελεῖ, κἂν σήμερον, κἂν αὔριον, κἂν ὁποτεροῦν μετάσχῃ τῆς κοινωνίας· οὐ γὰρ ἐν παρατηρήσει καιρῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν συνειδότι καθαρῷ ἡ ἀρίστη κρίνεται πρόσοδος.

we fast.' But then this fast was observed with a great deal of liberty. For he says in the same place, 'If a man come with a pure conscience, he keeps the Pasch, whether he partakes of the communion to-day, or to-morrow, or at any other time.' And therefore he says, in another place[69], 'It was usual in Lent for the people to ask one another how many weeks they had fasted, and one would answer he had fasted two weeks, another three, another all. And what advantage is it, if we have kept the fast without mending our morals? If another says, I have fasted the whole Lent, say thou, I had an enemy, and I am reconciled to him; I had a custom of reviling, and I have left it off; I was used to swearing, and I have broken the evil habit. It is of no advantage to fast, if our fasting do not produce such fruits as these.' In other places he intimates that a great liberty was allowed men in regard to their infirmities, and that they were left in a great measure to fast at their own discretion. 'Let no one,' says he[70], 'place his confidence in fasting only, if he continues in his sins without reforming. For it may be one that fasts not at all may obtain pardon, if he has the excuse of bodily infirmity: but he that does not correct his sins can have no excuse. Thou hast not fasted by reason of the weakness of thy body: but why art thou not reconciled to thy enemies? Canst thou pretend bodily infirmity here? If thou retainest hatred and envy, what apo-

[69] Hom. 16. ad Pop. Antioch. t. 1. p. 211. (t. 2. p. 168 d.) *Ἔθος ἅπασιν ἐρωτᾶν κατὰ τὴν Τεσσαρακοστὴν, πόσας ἕκαστος ἑβδομάδας ἐνήστευσε; καὶ ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι λεγόντων, τῶν μὲν, ὅτι δύο, τῶν δὲ, ὅτι πρεῖς, τῶν δὲ, ὅτι πάσας ἐνήστευσαν τὰς ἑβδομάδας. Καὶ τί τὸ κέρδος, ἐὰν ἔρημοι κατορθωμάτων παρέλθωμεν τὴν νηστείαν; ἐὰν ἕτερος λέγῃ, ὅτι πᾶσαν ἐνήστευσα τὴν Τεσσαρακοστὴν, σὺ εἰπὲ, ὅτι ἐχθρὸν εἶχον καὶ κατηλλάγην· ἔθος εἶχον κατηγορεῖν, καὶ ἐπαυσάμην· ἔθος εἶχον ὀμνύναι, καὶ ἔλυσα τὸ πονηρὸν ἔθος. Οὐδὲν ὄφελος τοῖς ἐμπόροις, ἂν πολὺ μῆκος πελάγους παραδράμωσιν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μετὰ φορτίων πλέωσι καὶ πολλῆς τῆς ἐμπορίας. Οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῆς νηστείας ἡμῖν, ἂν παρέλθωμεν αὐτὴν ἁπλῶς, εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην.*

[70] Hom. 22. de Ira. t. 1. p. 277. [Benedict. Hom. 20. ad Pop. Antioch.] (ibid. p. 199 c.) *Μηδεὶς μόνῃ τῇ νηστείᾳ ἐπιστηριζέσθω, ἐὰν τοῖς κακοῖς ἔμεινεν ἀδιόρθωτος· τὸν μὲν γὰρ μὴ νηστεύοντα εἰκὸς καὶ συγγνώμης τυχεῖν, σώματος ἀσθένειαν προβαλλόμενον· τὸν δὲ μὴ διορθώσαντα ἑαυτοῦ τὰ πλημμελήματα, ἀμήχανον ἀπολογίας τυχεῖν. Οὐκ ἐνήστευσας διὰ τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς ἀσθένειαν· τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐ κατηλλάγης, εἰπέ μοι; μὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀσθένειαν σώματος προβαλέσθαι ἔχεις; Πάλιν ἂν βασκανίαν καὶ φθόνον μένῃς ἔχων, ποίαν ἕξεις ἀπολογίαν, εἰπέ μοι; Οὐδαμοῦ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τοῖς ἐλαττώμασιν ἐπὶ σώματος ἀσθένειάν ἐστι καταφυγεῖν.* [The first clause of this passage. *Μηδεὶς κ. τ. λ.*, is wanting in the Edition of Ducæus, and is found in Savil's in the margin, (t. 6. p. 199 c.); the Benedictine has introduced them into the text. Ed.]

logy canst thou make? In such crimes as these thou canst not fly to the refuge of bodily weakness.' So again more copiously prosecuting this matter in another place[71]: 'If thou canst not pass all the day fasting by reason of bodily weakness, no wise man can condemn thee for this. For we have a kind and merciful Lord, who requires nothing of us above our strength. He neither requires abstinence from meat nor fasting simply of us, nor that for this end we should continue without eating only; but that sequestering ourselves from worldly affairs we should spend all our leisure time in spiritual things. For if we would order our lives soberly, and lay out our spare hours upon spiritual things, and eat only so much as we had need of and nature required, and spend our whole lives in good works, we should not need help of fasting. But because human nature is negligent, and gives itself rather to ease and pleasure, therefore our kind Lord, as a compassionate father, hath found out this medicine of fasting for us, that we should abridge ourselves in our pleasures, and transfer our care of secular things to works of a spiritual nature. If therefore there be any here

[71] Hom. 10. in Gen. t. 2. p. 91. (t. 4. p. 72 c, seqq.) Εἰ δὲ δι' ἀσθένειαν σωματικὴν, ἀγαπητὲ, οὐ δύνασαι [al. μὴ δύναιο] ἄσιτος παρατείνειν τὴν ἡμέραν, οὐδεὶς εὐφρονῶν ὑπὲρ τούτου σοι ἐγκαλέσαι δυνήσεται. Δεσπότην γὰρ ἔχομεν ἥμερον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν παρ' ἡμῶν ἐκζητοῦντα· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν βρωμάτων, καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἁπλῶς ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν γίνεσθαι· οὐδὲ διὰ τοῦτο, ἵνα ἄσιτοι διαμείνωμεν μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα, ἀφιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων, πᾶσαν τὴν σχολὴν ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς ἀναλίσκωμεν. Ὡς εἰ μετὰ νηφούσης διανοίας τὸν ἑαυτῶν βίον οἰκονομῶμεν, καὶ περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πᾶσαν τὴν σχολὴν ἐπιδεικνύμεθα, καὶ τῇ τροφῇ οὕτω προσίωμεν, ὡς τὴν χρείαν μόνον πληροῦν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀγαθαῖς πράξεσιν ἅπαντα τὸν βίον καταναλίσκειν, οὐδὲ χρεία ἡμῖν ἦν τῆς βοηθείας τῆς ἀπὸ τῆς νηστείας. Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ ῥᾴθυμός ἐστιν ἡ φύσις ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη, καὶ τῇ ἀνέσει καὶ τῇ τρυφῇ μᾶλλον ἑαυτὴν ἐπιδίδωσι, διὰ τοῦτο, καθάπερ πατὴρ φιλόστοργος, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς νηστείας ἡμῖν ἰατρείαν ἐπενόησεν ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Δεσπότης· ἵνα καὶ τὰ τῆς τρυφῆς ἡμῖν ἐκκόπτηται, καὶ τὴν περὶ τὰ βιωτικὰ φροντίδα μεταγάγωμεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐργασίαν. Ἂν τοίνυν ὦσί τινες τῶν ἐνταῦθα συνιόντων ὑπὸ ἀσθενείας σωματικῆς κωλυόμενοι, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι ἄσιτοι διαμένειν, τούτοις παραινῶ καὶ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τὴν σωματικὴν παραμυθεῖσθαι, καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας ταύτης τῆς πνευματικῆς μὴ ἀποστερεῖν ἑαυτοὺς, ἀλλὰ ταύτῃ μᾶλλον πλείονα τὴν σπουδὴν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι. Εἰσὶ γάρ, εἰσιν ὁδοὶ πολλαὶ μείζους τῆς ἀποχῆς τῶν βρωμάτων, αἱ δυνάμεναι τὰς θύρας ἡμῖν ἀνοίγειν τῆς παρρησίας τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. Ὁ τροφῆς τοίνυν μεταλαμβάνων, καὶ νηστεύειν μὴ δυνάμενος, δαψιλεστέραν τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην ἐπιδεικνύσθω, εὐχὰς ἐκτενεῖς, τὴν προθυμίαν ἐπιτεταμένην ἐχέτω περὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τῶν θείων. Ἐνταῦθα οὐδὲν ἡ τοῦ σώματος ἀσθένεια ἐμπόδιον ἡμῖν γίνεται· τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καταλλαττέσθω, πᾶσαν μνησικακίαν ἐξοριζέτω τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς. Ἂν ταῦτα κατορθοῦν βούληται, τὴν ἀληθῆ νηστείαν ἐπιδειξάτω, καὶ ἣν μάλιστα πάντων ἀπαιτεῖ παρ' ἡμῶν ὁ Δεσπότης. Ἐπεὶ

present who are hindered by bodily infirmity, and cannot continue all the day fasting, I exhort them to have regard to the weakness of their bodies, and not upon that account deprive themselves of this spiritual instruction, but for that very reason to pay more diligent attendance on it. For there are many ways besides abstinence from meat which will open to us the door of confidence towards God. He therefore that eats, and cannot fast, let him give the more plentiful alms, let him be more fervent in his prayers, let him show the greater alacrity and readiness in hearing the divine oracles: for the weakness of the body is no impediment in such offices as these: let him be reconciled to his enemies, and forget injuries, and cast all thoughts of revenge out of his mind. He that does these things will show forth the true fasting, which the Lord chiefly requires. Therefore I exhort you, who are able to fast, to go on with all possible alacrity in this good and laudable work. For by how much more our outward man perishes, so much more our inward man is renewed. For fasting restrains the body, and checks and bridles its inordinate sallies; but makes the soul much brighter, and gives it wings to mount up and soar on high. Do you also exhort your brethren, that are not able to fast for the weakness of their bodies, that they should

καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν βρωμάτων διὰ τοῦτο κελεύει γίνεσθαι, ἵνα χαλινοῦντες τὰ σκιρτήματα τῆς σαρκὸς, εὐήνιον αὐτὴν ἐργαζώμεθα πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐκπλήρωσιν. Εἰ δὲ μέλλοιμεν μηδὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς νηστείας βοήθειαν ἑαυτοῖς προσάγειν διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀσθένειαν, καὶ πλείονα τὴν ῥᾳθυμίαν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι, λανθάνομεν ἑαυτοὺς τὰ μέγιστα ζημιούμενοι. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ νηστείας ἡ τῶν προειρημένων κατορθωμάτων ἔλλειψις οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς ὀνίνησι, πολλῷ μᾶλλον εἰ, μηδὲ τῷ φαρμάκῳ τῆς νηστείας χρήσασθαι δυνάμενοι, πλείονα τὴν ῥαθυμίαν ἐπιδειξόμεθα. Ταῦτα δὴ μαθόντες παρ' ἡμῶν, παρακαλῶ, οἱ νηστεύειν δυνάμενοι, αὐτοί τε καθ' ὅσον οἷόν τε ἐπιτείνετε ὑμῶν τὴν καλὴν ταύτην καὶ ἐπαινετὴν προθυμίαν. Ὅσῳ γὰρ ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται, τοσοῦτον ὁ ἔσω ἀνακαινοῦται. Ἡ γὰρ νηστεία τὸ μὲν σῶμα κατατείνει, καὶ χαλινοῖ τὰ ἄτακτα σκιρτήματα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν διαυγεστέραν ἐργάζεται καὶ πτεροῖ, καὶ μετάρσιον καὶ κούφην ποιεῖ. Καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς δὲ τοὺς ὑμετέρους, ὅσοι διὰ σωματικὴν ἀσθένειαν νηστεύειν οὐ δύνανται, προτρέπεσθε μὴ ἀπολιμπάνεσθαι τῆς πνευματικῆς ταύτης τροφῆς, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς, καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς διαπορθμεύοντες, καὶ δεικνῦντες, ὅτι ὁ φαγὼν καὶ πιὼν μετρίως οὐκ ἀνάξιός ἐστι ταύτης τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ἀλλ' ὁ ῥᾳθυμος καὶ διακεχυμένος. Καὶ λέγετε πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὸ ἀποστολικὸν λόγιον, Ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων, Κυρίῳ ἐσθίει, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων, Κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ ὁ νηστεύων τοίνυν εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι δύναμιν ἔσχε δυναμένην ἀντισχεῖν πρὸς τὸν πόνον τῆς νηστείας· καὶ ὁ ἐσθίων πάλιν εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτὸν τοῦτο λυμήνασθαι δύναται πρὸς τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς σωτηρίαν, ἐὰν θέλῃ.

not upon that account absent themselves from this spiritual food: but teach them and inform them what you have learned of us, that he that eats and drinks with moderation is not unworthy of this auditory, but only he that is negligent and dissolute. Tell them what the Apostle says, "Both he that eateth, eateth to the Lord: and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks:" therefore he that fasteth giveth God thanks, who has enabled him to bear the labour of fasting; and he that eateth gives God thanks likewise, that this is no prejudice to the salvation of his soul, if he be otherwise willing and obedient.'

I have recited these passages at large out of Chrysostom, to show what notion he had of the obligation men were under to observe the Lent fast. If men were in health and able to bear it, the rule and custom was for them to observe it; and they generally did so without any further admonition: but if they did not comply, their non-compliance did not debar them from the communion at Easter, or lay them under any ecclesiastical censure as great delinquents. On the other hand, if they pleaded bodily infirmity and weakness, that was always accepted as a just apology, provided that they made it appear by their other good works that they were sincere and zealous, and not merely acting a part in the business of religion. And some footsteps of this liberty, in leaving men to a discretionary observation of Lent, are described by learned men in several other writers. Bishop Hooper [71] observes out of Tertullian [72], that except Friday and Saturday before Easter, the Catholics in his time kept no other days of fasting in Lent but only at discretion; and that their fast was for the most part private, and not distinguished by any public action. And Bishop Taylor [73] asserts the same, not only out of Tertullian, but Socrates,

[71] Discourse of Lent, part 1. ch. 4. (pp. 63, 64.) From Tertullian's management, &c.

[72] De Jejun. cc. 2. et 13. See before, s. 2. p. 383. nn. 9 and 10.

[73] Duct. Dubitant. p. 629. (rule 13. s. 9. Works, v. 14. p. 31.) This first appears in that we find it affirmed often in antiquity, that the fasts of the Church were arbitrary, and chosen without necessity and imposition from any authority, which thing was observed by Socrates [lib. 5. c. 22.], speaking of the Lent fast: 'Because no man can show in any record that there was a commandment concerning this thing, it is manifest that the Apostles did permit a free power in the same, leaving to every one's mind and choice, that every one might do what was good, without the inducement of fear or of necessity.' 'For so we ought to fast and abstain, saith Prosper [De

Prudentius, Victor Antiochenus, Prosper, and St. Austin: 'for the fasts of the Church were arbitrary and chosen, without necessity and imposition from any authority.' He means not only the imposition of apostolical or divine authority upon the Church in general, but the imposition of them by any authority of the Church upon her own members, as laying any necessary obligation on them. And this is true of the three or four first ages of the Church, but more questionable of those that followed after. For the fourth Council of Orleans orders[74], that all who refused to fast on Saturday in Lent should be made liable to ecclesiastical censure; and among those

Vita Contemplat. l. 2. c. 24.] that we may not submit our souls to a necessity of fasting and abstaining, that we may not do a voluntary thing by an involuntary devotion.' But of this we have elder testimony; for when Tertullian scraped together all that he could to justify the Lents of Montanus, the new fasts, which he for discipline would have had the Churches for ever to observe; he laid hold upon the practice of the Catholics to verify Montanus's imposition, saying, that the Catholic bishops did enjoin fasts sometimes, *et ex aliqua solicitudinis ecclesiasticæ causa, upon the occasion of some trouble or affliction in the Church*, [Lib. de Jejun. c. 13.] that is, temporary fasts, or solemn days upon special emergent accidents. He adds also, that they kept the Paschal fast, the two days before Easter, in which the Bridegroom was taken from them; but in these days they sometimes live on bread and water, *ut cuique videbatur, et hæc ex arbitrio agentes et non ex imperio; they did this not by any command, but by choice, as they pleased themselves*: for so the Catholics did say and believe, *sic et Apostolos observasse, nullum aliud imponentes jugum certorum et in commune omnibus obeundorum jejuniorum*, [cap. 2.]; that the Apostles did fast as every Christian else did, and ought to do, *ex arbitrio, pro temporibus et causis uniuscujusque, as every one had cause, and opportunity, and will; but they imposed no other yoke of certain and for ever to be observed fasts.*

Laxus ac liber modus abstinendi
Ponitur cunctis: neque nos severus
Terror impellit: sua quemque cogit
Velle potestas.
Sufficit, quicquid facias, vocato
Numinis nutu prius, inchoare,
Sive tu mensam renuas, cibumve
Sumere tentes.

So Prudentius [Cathemer. Hymn. 8.] expressly affirming, that even in his time there were no laws of set and annual fasts: for that very thing Victor Antiochenus [in Marc. c. 2.] makes to be a difference between the Old and New Testament: for the faithful in that time had fasting days appointed by God, *quæ proinde modis omnibus explere obligabantur, etiamsi alias noluissent, which they were bound by all means to observe, though against their will;* but under the Gospel, we fast by the love of virtue, and the choice of our own will, rather than by the coaction of any law. For, *quibus diebus jejunandum sit, nullo Apostolorum præcepto definitum reperiri*, said St. Austin, [Epist. 68. ad Casulanum]; *What days we are to fast, is nowhere to be found determined by any precept of the Apostles.*

[74] An. 541. c. 2. (t. 5. p. 382 a.) .... Sed neque per Sabbata absque infirmitate quisquam solvat quadragesimale [al. Quadragesimæ] jejunium. .... Si quis hanc regulam irruperit, tanquam transgressor disciplinæ a sacerdotibus censeatur.

called the Apostolical Canons there is one[75] that orders, 'that every clergyman, who not being infirm refuses to fast in Lent, shall be deposed; and laymen shall be suspended from communion for the same transgression.' But this is one of those canons which are known to be of later date[76], and therefore cannot be concluded to be according to the ancient rule of the Church.

How the Montanists differed from the Church about the imposition of fasts.

15. From this it will be easy to account for the difference which happened between the Church and the Montanists about the imposition of fasts. Montanus is condemned by the writers of that age for making new laws about fasting. In the fragment of Apollonius, mentioned by Eusebius[77], it is laid to his charge that he was the first ὁ νηστείας νομοθετήσας, *who imposed fastings by his laws.* Which some understand as if he was the first that ever brought fasting under any rule or law. Which cannot be true: for, as we have seen before, the Church

[75] C. 69. [al. 68.] (Cotel. [c. 61.] v. 1. p. 446.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ἀναγνώστης, ἢ ψάλτης, τὴν ἁγίαν Τεσσαρακοστὴν [τοῦ Πάσχα] οὐ νηστεύει [al. νηστεύοι], ἢ Τετράδα, ἢ Παρασκευὴν, καθαιρείσθω· ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ δι' ἀσθένειαν σωματικὴν ἐμποδίζοιτο· ἐὰν δὲ λαϊκὸς ᾖ, ἀφοριζέσθω.—Conf. C. Tolet. 8. c. 9. (t. 6. p. 407 b.) Nonæ [leg. Novæ] intentionis admonitu detecta est ingluvies horrenda voracium, quæ dum fræno parsimoniæ non astringitur, religioni contraria censetur. Nam dicente Scriptura, *Qui spernit minima, paullatim decidet in maxima;* illi tanto edacitatis improbæ sumptu grassantur, ut cœlestia et pene summa contemnere videantur. Etenim cum Quadragesimæ dies anni totius decimæ deputentur, quæ in oblatione jejunii Domini [al. Domino] consecrantur, quibus etiam saluberrime conditio humani generis expiatur, dum a quatuor mundi partibus ad hanc homo religionem crediturus adducitur; quatuor elementis formatus, propter transgressionem Decalogi quater decies convenienter affligitur: illi, ausu temerario hæc omnia contemnentes, voracitatis ingluviem non frænant, et, quod pejus est, Paschalia festa illicitorum esuum præceptione [al. perceptione] profanant. Quibus ex hoc adeo acerrime interdicitur, ut quisquis absque inevitabili necessitate, atque fragilitatis evidenti languore, seu etiam ætatis impossibilitate, diebus Quadragesimæ esum carnium præsumpserit attentare, non solum reus erit resurrectionis Dominicæ, verum etiam alienus ab ejusdem diei sancta communione. Et hoc illi cumuletur ad pœnam, ut ipsius anni tempore ab omni esu carnium abstineat gulam: quia sacris diebus abstinentiæ oblitus est disciplinam. Illi vero, quos aut ætas incurvat, aut languor extenuat, aut necessitas arctat, non ante prohibita violare præsumant, quam a sacerdote permissum accipiant.

[76] [See the note of Binius at the end of the fifty canons given by Labbe and Cossart in their Edition. (CC. t. 1. p. 53.) *Horum* 50. *priores tantum, &c.*—Also Bp. Beveridge's *Judicium de Numero et Auctoritate Canonum Apostolicorum*, in Cotelerius, (Amstel. 1724. t. 1. p. 432.) s. 2. *Quod ad numerum attinet, &c.* Ed.]

[77] L. 5. c. 18. (v. 1. p. 233. 38.) Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ διδάξας λύσεις γάμων, ὁ νηστείας νομοθετήσας.

also thought she had a rule for fasting two days before Easter: and Tertullian[78] also in vindication of Montanus tells the Catholics, which they themselves did not deny, 'that their bishops were used to appoint fasts upon necessary occasions of the Church.' Therefore this could not be the dispute then, whether fasting might be imposed by a law: but the Montanists said, beside the fast of Lent observed by the Catholics, there were other fasts imposed by the Spirit under the ministry and revelation of the will of God made to Montanus. For the Montanists kept three Lents in the year[79], each of these two weeks, and that upon dry meats in perfect abstinence from flesh; and these also as necessary to be observed as injunctions of the Spirit by the new revelation made to Montanus, which they preferred before the writings of the Apostles, and said these laws were to be observed for ever. Which is the reason why the Montanists in the time of Sozomen kept their ante-paschal fast still confined to two weeks, when the Catholics fasted a much longer space. For, as a learned person[80] observes, 'those great fasters would hardly have been left behind, had not those two weeks been the space determined them by their prophet, and they obliged to keep punctually to all his institutions.' This then was the great dispute between the Catholics and the Montanists, Whether the Spirit had appointed these fasts? which the Montanists asserted and the Catholics denied. And therefore, though the Church augmented her fast from two days to forty, yet still she did it with a great deal of liberty reserved to every particular Church, and every particular Church in a great measure left all her members to judge of their own abilities by Christian prudence and discretion; exhorting men to fast, but imposing rigidly upon none more

[78] De Jejun. c. 13. (p. 551 c.) Bene autem, quod et episcopi universæ plebi mandare jejunia assolent, non dico de industria stipium conferendarum, ut vestræ capturæ est, sed interdum et ex aliqua solicitudinis ecclesiasticæ causa.

[79] Ep. 54. [al. 41.] ad Marcellam. (t. 1. p. 187 a.) Nos unam Quadragesimam .... jejunamus, illi [Montanistæ] tres in anno faciunt Quadragesimas. — In Hag. c. 1. (t. 6. p. 750 a.) Qui tribus Quadragesimis per annum jejunantes, et ξηροφαγίοις humiliantes animam suam, &c. —Tertul. de Jejun. c. 15. (p. 552 c.) Quantula est enim apud nos interdictio ciborum! Duas in anno hebdomadas xerophagiarum, nec totas, exceptis scilicet Sabbatis et Dominicis, offerimus Deo; abstinentes ab eis, quæ non rejicimus, sed [non] differimus.

[80] Bishop Hooper: Discourse of Lent, part. 1. ch. 4. n. f. 2. (p. 65.) In Sozomen's time, &c.

than they were able and willing to bear, nor enforcing it under pain of ecclesiastical censure.

16. The manner of observing Lent, among those that were piously disposed to observe it, was to abstain from all food till evening. For anciently a change of diet was not reckoned a fast; but it consisted in a perfect abstinence from all sustenance for the whole day till evening. And in this the Lent fast differed from the *semijejunia*, or *half-fasts* of the ordinary stationary days, as we shall see hereafter, [in the next section]. St. Ambrose, speaking of the Lent fast[81], says, 'it was a total abstinence every day throughout the whole season, except on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day.' And in another place[82], exhorting men to observe the Lent fast, he bids them 'defer eating a little; the end of the day is not far off.' So Chrysostom frequently in his Lent Sermons[83] speaks of the same circumstance: 'Let us set a guard upon our ears, our tongues, and minds, and not think that bare fasting till the evening is sufficient for our salvation.' 'What profit[84] is it to fast, and eat nothing all the day, if you give yourself to playing at dice, and other vain pastimes, and spend the whole day many times in perjuries and blasphemies?' 'The true fast[85] is abstinence

The Lent-fast kept with a perfect abstinence from all food every day till evening.

[81] De Elia et Jejun. c. 10. (t. 1. p. 545 b. n. 34.) Quadragesima totis præter Sabbatum et Dominicam jejunatur diebus.

[82] In Ps. 118. v. 62. Serm. 8. (t. 1. p. 1073 e. n. 48.) Differ aliquantulum; non longe finis est diei.

[83] Hom. 4. in Gen. t. 2. p. 37. (t. 4. p. 29 c.) Τὴν δὲ διάνοιαν παιδεύωμεν μηδὲν προΐεσθαι τῶν βλαβερῶν· ἀλλὰ κἂν ἔξωθέν τι ἐπεισφέρηται τοιοῦτο, ταῦτα ὡς περιττὰ καὶ βλάπτειν δυνάμενα [al. τοῦτο ὡς περιττὸν καὶ βλάπτειν δυνάμενον] ἀποσείεσθαι, κἂν ἔνδοθεν τίκτηται, ταχέως αὐτὰ [al. αὐτὸ] φυγαδεύειν τῷ εὐσεβεῖ λογισμῷ, καὶ μὴ νομίζωμεν τὴν ἀσιτίαν μόνον τὴν μέχρι τῆς ἑσπέρας ἀρκεῖν ἡμῖν πρὸς σωτηρίαν.

[84] Hom. 6. in Gen. p. 60. (ibid. p. 48 a.) Τί γὰρ ὄφελος, εἰπέ μοι, τῆς νηστείας, ὅταν ἄσιτος μὲν διημερεύῃς, κύβοις δὲ ἑαυτὸν ἐκδιδῷς, καὶ φλυαρίαις ἀνονήτοις, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐπιορκίαις καὶ βλασφημίαις πᾶσαν ἀναλώσῃς τὴν ἡμέραν;

[85] Hom. 8. in Gen. p. 79. (ibid. p. 82 e.)... Καὶ πᾶσα ἡμῶν ἡ φροντὶς ἔστω περὶ τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν σωτηρίας, καὶ ὅπως δυνηθείημεν τὰ σκιρτήματα τῆς σαρκὸς χαλινώσαντες τὴν ἀληθινὴν νηστείαν ἐπιδείξασθαι, λέγω δὴ τὴν τῶν κακῶν ἀποχήν· τοῦτο γὰρ νηστεία. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ βρωμάτων ἀποχὴ διὰ τοῦτο παρείληπται, ἵνα τὸν τόνον τῆς σαρκὸς χαλινώσῃ, καὶ εὐήνιον ἡμῶν τὸν ἵππον ἐργάσηται. Τὸν νηστεύοντα μάλιστα πάντων προσήκει τὸν θυμὸν χαλινοῦν, πραότητα πεπαιδεῦσθαι καὶ ἐπιείκειαν, συντετριμμένην ἔχειν τὴν καρδίαν, τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν ἀτόπων ἐξορίζειν τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις, πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν λαμβάνοντα τὸν ἀκοίμητον [al. ἐκεῖνον] ὀφθαλμὸν, καὶ τὸ κριτήριον τὸ ἀδέκαστον, χρημάτων κρείττονα γίνεσθαι, περὶ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην πολλὴν τὴν δαψίλειαν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι, πᾶσαν κακίαν τὴν περὶ τὸν πλησίον ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπελαύνειν. Αὕτη ἀληθὴς ἡ νηστεία.....Ταύτην ἀσκήσωμεν, καὶ μὴ ἁπλῶς κατὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς νομίζωμεν, ἐν τούτῳ τὰ τῆς νηστείας ἡμῖν

from vices. For abstinence from meat was appointed upon this occasion, that we should curb the tone of our flesh, and make the horse obedient to his rider. He that fasts ought above all things to bridle his anger, to learn meekness and clemency, to have a contrite heart, to banish the thoughts of all inordinate desires, to set the watchful eye of God before his eyes, and his uncorrupted judgment; to set himself above riches, and exercise great liberality in giving of alms, and to expel every evil thought against his neighbour out of his soul. This is the true fast. Therefore let this be our care: and let us not imagine, as many do, that we have fasted rightly when we have abstained from eating until evening. This is not the thing required of us; but that, together with our abstinence from meat, we should abstain from those things that hurt the soul, and diligently exercise ourselves in things of a spiritual nature.' Bellarmin himself[86] shows the same out of St. Basil[87] and other ancient writers, who speak always of the Lent fast as a perfect abstinence from all food till evening. And it is very remarkable by what he cites out of Micrologus, Gratian, and St. Bernard, that this custom continued till the twelfth century even in the practice of the Romish Church.

Change of diet not accounted a proper fast for Lent, without perfect abstinence till evening.

17. Whence it were easy to conclude, that the pretence of keeping Lent only by change of diet from flesh to fish, or a more delicious food which allows men the use of wine and other delicacies, is but a mock fast and a mere innovation, utterly unknown to the Ancients, whose Lent fast was a strict and rigorous abstinence from all food till the evening. Their refreshment was only a supper, and not a dinner of any kind: and then it was indifferent, whether it was flesh or any other food, provided it was used, as became the refreshment of a fast, with sobriety and moderation. They generally indeed abstained from flesh, and wine, and fish, and all other delicacies at this season: but yet there was no such universal rule or

περιορίζεσθαι, ἐὰν μεχρὶ τῆς ἑσπέρας ἄσιτοι διαμείνωμεν. Οὐ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ζητούμενον, ἀλλ' ἵνα μετὰ τῆς τῶν βρωμάτων ἀποχῆς καὶ τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν βλαπτόντων ἐπιδειξώμεθα. καὶ περὶ τὴν τῶν πνευματικῶν ἐργασίαν πολλὴν σπουδὴν ποιησώμεθα.

[86] De Bonis Operibus, l. 2. c. 2. (t. 4. p. 1208 a.) Sanctus Basilius Oratione prima de Jejunio, de Quadragesima loquens, *Exspectas*, inquit, *vesperam, ut cibum capias.*

[87] Hom. 1. de Jejun. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 12 b. n. 10.) *Τὴν ἑσπέραν ἀναμείνεις εἰς μετάληψιν, ἀλλὰ δαπανᾷς τὴν ἡμέραν εἰς δικαστήρια.*

custom in this matter, but that when men had fasted all the day, they were allowed to refresh themselves with a moderate supper upon flesh or any other food without distinction.

This appears from the observation which Socrates[88] makes upon the different manner of fasting in Lent: 'Some,' says he, 'abstain from all kind of living creatures; others abstain from all fish; others eat fowls as well as fish, saying, that according to Moses they come of the water; others abstain from fruits and eggs; others eat only dry bread; and others even not so much as that.' Yet the greatest ascetics made no scruple to eat flesh in Lent when a just occasion required it. Sozomen[89] tells a remarkable story of Spyridion, bishop of Trimythus in Cyprus, 'that a stranger once happening to call upon him in his travels in Lent, he having nothing in his house but a piece of pork, ordered that to be dressed and set before him: but the stranger refusing to eat flesh, saying he was a Christian, Spyridion replied, For that very reason thou oughtest not to refuse it; for the word of God has pronounced all things clean to them that are clean.'

Eusebius[90] tells a like story of one Alcibiades, a martyr, who, 'being a great ascetic, had used to abstain from flesh all his life, and live only upon bread and water; which course of life he continued even in prison: but it was revealed to Attalus, one of his fellow-prisoners, that Alcibiades did not well to refuse using the creatures of God, and thereby give scandal to

[88] L. 5. c. 22. See before, s. 3. p. 386. n. 18.

[89] L. 1. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 24. 10.) *Ἤδη τῆς Τεσσαρακοστῆς ἐνστάσης, ἥκέ τις πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξ ὁδοιπορίας, ἐν αἷς εἰώθει μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπισυνάπτειν τὴν νηστείαν, καὶ εἰς ῥητὴν ἡμέραν γεύεσθαι, ἄσιτος τὰς ἐν μέσῳ διαμένων· ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν ξένον μάλα κεκμηκότα, Ἄγε δή, πρὸς τὴν θυγατέρα ἔφη, ὅπως τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοὺς πόδας νίψῃς, καὶ φαγεῖν αὐτῷ παράθες· εἰπούσης δὲ τῆς παρθένου, μή τε ἄρτον εἶναι, μήτε ἅλφιτα· περιττὴ γὰρ ἡ τούτων παρασκευὴ διὰ τὴν νηστείαν· δεξάμενος πρότερον καὶ συγγνώμην αἰτήσας, ἐκέλευσε τῇ θυγατρὶ, κρέα ὕεια, ἅπερ ἔτυχε τῇ οἰκίᾳ τεταριχευμένα, ἑψεῖν· ἐπεὶ δὲ ἥψητο, καθίσας ἅμα αὐτῷ τὸν ξένον, παρατεθέντων τῶν κρεῶν ἤσθιε, καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα παρεκάλει αὐτὸν μιμεῖσθαι· παραιτούμενον δὲ, λέγοντα Χριστιανὸν ἑαυτὸν, Ταύτῃ μᾶλλον, ἔφη, οὐ παραιτητέον· πάντα γὰρ καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς ὁ θεῖος ἀπεφήνατο λόγος.*

[90] L. 5. c. 3. (v. 1. p. 212. 28.) *Ἀλκιβιάδου γάρ τινος ἐξ αὐτῶν, πάνυ αὐχμηρὸν βιοῦντος βίον, καὶ μηδενὸς ὅλως τὸ πρότερον μεταλαμβάνοντος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ καὶ ὕδατι χρωμένου, πειρωμένου τε καὶ ἐν τῇ εἱρκτῇ οὕτω διάγειν, Ἀττάλῳ μετὰ τὸν πρῶτον ἀγῶνα, ὃν ἐν τῷ ἀμφιθεάτρῳ ἤνυσεν, ἀπεκαλύφθη, ὅτι μὴ καλῶς ποιοίη ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης μὴ χρώμενος τοῖς κτίσμασι τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἄλλοις τύπον σκανδάλου ὑπολειπόμενος· πεισθεὶς δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδης, πάντων ἀνέδην μετελάμβανε, καὶ ηὐχαρίστει τῷ Θεῷ.*

others. Upon which admonition Alcibiades changed his manner of living, and began to use all meats indifferently with thanksgiving.' By this it appears that the eating or not eating of flesh was a thing indifferent to them at all times, and that they made no scruple to eat flesh even in Lent upon a necessary occasion, without any prejudice to their rules of fasting. But the thing they chiefly guarded against was luxury, and pampering the body under pretence of fasting.

St. Austin makes a smart reflection in one of his Sermons[91] upon such pretenders as these. 'There are some observers of Lent,' says he, 'that study deliciousness more than religion, and seek out new pleasures for the belly, more than how to chastise the concupiscence of the old man; who by costly and plentiful provisions strive to outdo the varieties and tastes of the several fruits of the earth. They are afraid of any vessels in which flesh has been boiled, as if they were unclean; and yet in their own flesh fear not the luxury of the throat and the belly. These men fast, not to diminish their wonted voracity by temperance, but by deferring a meal to increase their immoderate greediness. For when the time of refreshment comes, they rush to their plentiful tables as beasts to their mangers, and stuff their bellies with great variety of artificial and strange sauces, taking in more by devouring than they are able to digest again by fasting. There are some likewise who drink no wine, that they may provide themselves other more agreeable liquors to gratify their taste rather than set forward their salvation: as if Lent were intended, not for

[91] Serm. 74. de Divers. t. 10. p. 550. [al. Serm. 210. c. 8.] (t. 5. p. 931 e, f.) Sunt quidam observatores Quadragesimæ, deliciosi potius quam religiosi, exquirentes novas suavitates magis quam veteres concupiscentias castigantes; qui copiosis pretiosisque apparatibus fructuum diversorum, quorumlibet obsoniorum varietates et sapores superare contendunt: vasa, in quibus coctæ sunt carnes, tanquam immunda formidant, et in sua carne ventris et gutturis luxuriam non formidant: jejunant, non ut solitam temperando minuant edacitatem, sed ut immoderatam differendo augeant aviditatem. Nam ubi tempus reficiendi advenerit, opimis mensis, tanquam pecora præsepibus, irruunt; numerosioribus ferculis corda obruunt, ventresque distendunt; artificiosis et peregrinis condimentorum diversitatibus gulam, ne vel copia compescatur, irritant. Denique tantum capiunt manducando, quantum digerere non sufficiant jejunando. Sunt etiam qui vinum ita non bibunt, ut aliorum expressione pomorum alios sibi liquores, non salutis causa, sed jucunditatis, exquirant: tanquam non sit Quadragesima piæ humilitatis observatio, sed novæ voluptatis occasio.

the observation of a pious humiliation, but as an occasion of seeking out new pleasures.' They did not think commutation of diet a proper fast, if the abstinence of the day was spoiled by any immoderate indulgence of an evening banquet: much less did they esteem it a fast to dine upon delicacies, and use a mere abstinence from flesh without deferring the time of their ordinary meal till evening; but they abstained all the day from food of any kind, and then contented themselves with a sober and plain refreshment in the close of it, without any scrupulous nicety about the kind of their food, so long as they used it only with temperance and moderation.

What they spared in a dinner, not spent in evening luxury, but bestowed on the poor.

18. And what they thus spared from their own bodies in abridging them of a meal, they that were piously disposed bestowed upon the bellies of the poor. This we learn from one of the Homilies of Cæsarius Arelatensis, or whoever was the author of it, under the name of St. Austin[92]. 'Before all things,' says he, 'on our fasting days, what we were used to spend upon a dinner let us bestow upon the poor, that no one concern himself about providing a sumptuous supper, or an exquisite and delicious feast, and seem rather to have changed the diet of his body than diminished any thing in the quantity of it. There is no profit in keeping a long fast all the day, if afterward a man overwhelm his soul either with the delicacy of his meat or the abundance of it. That which is gained by the fast at dinner ought not to be turned into a feast at supper, but be expended on the bellies of the poor.' '*Proficiat eleemosynis, quod non expenditur mensis,*' says Leo[93]; '*that which is not expended upon our tables should be laid out in alms,* and then it will bring us in great gain.' Origen[94] says he found it in some book as a noted saying of the Apostles,

[92] Serm. 56. de Temp. t. 10. p. 252. [al. Append. Serm. 141.] (t. 5. append. 251 a.) Ante omnia in diebus jejuniorum, quod solebamus prandere, pauperibus erogemus; ne forte aliquis sibi sumptuosas cœnas et exquisitis saporibus epulas studeat præparare, et corpori suo magis commutasse quam subtraxisse ciborum abundantiam videatur. Nihil prodest tota die longum duxisse jejunium, si postea ciborum suavitate vel nimietate anima obruatur.

[93] Serm. 3. [al. 80.] de Jejun. Pentecost. (t. 1. p. 319.) .... Ita ut proficiat eleemosynis, quod non impenditur mensis. Tunc enim demum ad animæ curationem proficit medicina jejunii, cum abstinentia jejunantis esuriem reficit indigentis.

[94] Hom. 10. in Levit. (t. 2. p. 246 a.) *Beatus est qui etiam jejunat pro eo, ut alat pauperem.* Hujus jejunium valde acceptum est apud Deum.

'Blessed is he who fasts for this end, that he may feed the poor! This man's fast is acceptable unto God.' 'Mercy and piety,' as Chrysologus[95] words it, 'are the wings of fasting, by which it mounts up to heaven, without which it lies dead upon the earth. Therefore when we fast let us lay up our dinner in the hands of the poor, that the hands of the poor may preserve for us what our bellies would destroy. The hand of the poor is the treasury of Christ: fasting without mercy is but an image of famine: fasting without works of piety is only an occasion of covetousness; because by such sparing, what is taken from the body only swells in the purse.'

All corporeal punishments forbidden by the imperial laws in Lent.

19. Therefore Lent was thought the proper season for exercising more abundantly all sorts of charity. 'Let us spend those vacant hours,' says Cæsarius or St. Austin[96], 'which we were used to lavish away without any benefit to our souls, now in visiting the sick, in searching the prisons, in entertaining strangers, in reconciling those that are at variance with one another.' This was required of those more especially who pretended bodily infirmity, that they could not fast, as we have heard before[97] out of St. Chrysostom: 'Thou canst not fast by reason of the weakness of thy body: but why art thou not reconciled to thy enemy? Canst thou pretend bodily infirmity here? If thou retainest hatred and envy, what apology canst thou make? In such crimes as these thou canst not take sanctuary in bodily weakness. He that cannot fast, let him give the more plentiful alms, let him be reconciled to his enemies, let him forget injuries, and cast all thoughts of revenge out of his mind.' This was a time when men expected mercy and pardon from God, and therefore it was the

[95] Serm. 8. de Jejun. (p. 13.) Misericordia et pietas jejunii sunt alæ, per quas tollitur et portatur ad cœlum, sine quibus jacet et volutatur in terra. Jejunium sine misericordia simulacrum famis est, imago nulla est sanctitatis, sine pietate jejunium occasio est avaritiæ ... quia parcitas ista quantum siccatur in corpore, tantum tumescit in sacculo ..... Jejunantes ergo fratres prandium nostrum reponamus in manu pauperis, ... quod venter nobis fuerat perditurus .... Manus pauperis est gazophylacium Christi: quia quicquid pauper accipit Christus acceptat.

[96] Hom. 56. de Temp. t. 10. p. 252. (ut supr. p. 251 a.) Horarum spatiis, in quibus solebamus cum damno animæ detineri, visitentur infirmi, requirantur in carcere constituti, peregrini suscipiantur, et discordes ad concordiam revocentur.

[97] See before, s. 14. nn. 70 and 71, preceding.

more reasonable they should be more eminent in the exercise of mercy toward their brethren. Upon this account the imperial laws forbad all prosecution of men in criminal actions, which might bring them to corporal punishment and torture, during the whole season. Theodosius the Great made two laws to this purpose: 'In the forty days[98], which by the laws of religion are solemnly observed before Easter, let the examination and hearing of all criminal questions be superseded:' and, 'In the holy days of Lent[99], let there be no punishments of the body when we expect the absolution of our souls.' St. Ambrose mentions[1] a like answer given by Valentinian the Younger in the case of some rich noblemen, who were prosecuted in a criminal cause before the provost of the city, who inclined to give a speedy sentence against them: but the emperor sent him an inhibition, forbidding any sentence of blood to be pronounced during the holy season. Nor was there any exception made to this rule, but only in the case of the Isaurian robbers, whose practices were so very dangerous to the common safety, that Theodosius Junior thought it proper to allow their examination by scourging and the rack at any time, not excepting any day in Lent or the Easter-festival[2], because it was greater charity to discover their wicked counsels and conspiracies, to preserve the life and safety of other innocent men, than to grant any reprieve or respite to such criminals upon the account of the holy season. So that mercy and charity was still the thing in view, as most proper to be showed to the bodies of men at such a season, when all expected, by their fasting and repentance, 'to obtain absolution of their souls from the hands of God,' as one of the forementioned laws elegantly words it.

[98] Cod. Theod. l. 9. tit. 35. de Quæstionibus, leg. 4. (t. 3. p. 252.) Quadraginta diebus, qui auspicio cærimoniarum Paschale tempus anticipant, omnis cognitio inhibeatur criminalium quæstionum.

[99] Ibid. leg. 5. (p. 253.) Sacratis Quadragesimæ diebus nulla supplicia sint corporis, quibus absolutio exspectatur animarum.

[1] De Obit. Valentin. (t. 2. p. 1179 c. n. 18.) Quid de pietate ejus loquar? qui, cum homines nobili ortos genere et locupleti prosapia, quæ cito movere invidiam solet, regiæ cupiditatis accusator urgeret, præfectus insisteret, respondit, ut nihil cruentum sanctis præsertim diebus statueretur.

[2] Ibid. leg. 7. (p. 255.) Provinciarum judices moneantur, ut in Isaurorum latronum quæstionibus nullum Quadragesimæ, nec venerabilem Pascharum diem existiment excipiendum, &c.

igious emblies l ser- ns every in at.

20. Lent was a time of more than ordinary strictness and devotion, and therefore in many of the great churches they had religious assemblies for prayer and preaching every day throughout the whole season. I cannot affirm that it was so in every parochial church and country village; but that it was so in the greater or cathedral churches, is evident from undeniable proofs and matter of fact. Chrysostom's Homilies on Genesis, and those famous ones of the Statues, called *Ἀνδριάντες*, to the people of Antioch, were sermons preached after this manner day after day in the Lent season, as any one may be satisfied that looks but into them. I will only relate one single passage in one of these Homilies[3], which will give any reader satisfaction. 'This is not,' says he, 'the only thing that is required, that we should meet here every day, and hear sermons continually, and fast the whole Lent: for if we gain nothing by these continual meetings and exhortations, and seasons of fasting, to the advantage of our souls, they will not only do us no good, but be the occasion of a severer condemnation. If after so much care and pains bestowed upon us, we continue the same; if the angry man does not become meek, and the passionate mild and gentle; if the envious does not reduce himself to a friendly temper, nor the covetous man depart from his madness and fury in the pursuit of riches, and give himself

[3] Hom. 11. in Gen. t. ii. p. 107. (t. 4. p. 85 d.) *Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ ζητούμενον, ἵνα καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐνταῦθα παραγινώμεθα, καὶ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν συνεχῶς ἀκούωμεν, καὶ τὴν Τεσσαρακοστὴν πᾶσαν νηστεύοντες ὦμεν. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ μέλλοιμέν τι κερδαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἐνταῦθα συνεχοῦς ἐλεύσεώς τε καὶ παραινέσεως, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς νηστείας καιροῦ προσφέρειν τι τῶν χρησίμων εἰς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ψυχήν, ταῦτα οὐ μόνον ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει, ἀλλὰ καὶ μείζονος ἡμῖν κατακρίσεως ἀφορμὴ γενήσεται, ὅταν τοσαύτας ἐπιμελείας ἀπολαύοντες, οἱ αὐτοὶ διαμένωμεν, καὶ μήτε ὁ ὀργίλος ἐπιεικὴς γίνηται, μήτε ὁ θυμώδης εἰς πραότητα μεταβάλλοιτο, μήτε ὁ βάσκανος εἰς φιλοφροσύνην ἑαυτὸν ἐναγάγῃ, μήτε ὁ περὶ τὰ χρήματα μεμηνὼς, ἀποστὰς τοῦ πάθους, πρὸς ἐλεημοσύνην ἑαυτὸν παρασκευάσῃ καὶ τὴν τῶν πενήτων διατροφὴν, μήτε ὁ ἀκόλαστος σώφρων γένοιτο, μήτε ὁ περὶ τὴν κενὴν ταύτην δόξαν ἐπτοημένος, μάθῃ ταύτης ὑπερορᾷν, καὶ τῆς ἀληθοῦς ἐφίεσθαι δόξης, μήτε ὁ περὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν περὶ τὸν πλησίον ῥάθυμος, διαναστήσας αὐτὸν, παιδεύσῃ μὴ μόνον τῶν τελωνῶν μὴ εἶναι ἐλάττων. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, φησι, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ἀλλ' ἵνα παρασκευάζῃ αὐτοῦ τὸν λογισμὸν, καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμέρως ὁρᾷν, καὶ πολλὴν περὶ αὐτοὺς τὴν ἀγάπην ἐπιδείκνυσθαι. Ἐὰν μὴ τούτων περιγενοίμεθα τῶν παθῶν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τικτομένων, καθ' ἑκάστην ἐνταῦθα παριγινόμενοι, καὶ συνεχοῦς ἀκροάσεως ἀπολαύοντες, καὶ τοσαύτης διδασκαλίας μετέχοντες, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς νηστείας ἔχοντες βοήθειαν, ποία ἡμῖν ἔσται συγγνώμη, ποία δὲ ἀπολογία;*

to almsdeeds and feeding the poor; if the intemperate man does not become chaste and sober, and the vain-glorious learn to despise false honour, and seek for that which is true; if he that is negligent of charity to his neighbour does not stir up himself, and endeavour not only not to come behind the publicans, who love those that love them, but also to look friendly upon his enemies, and exercise all acts of charity toward them; if we do not conquer these affections, and all others that spring up from our natural corruption, though we assemble here every day, and enjoy continual preaching and teaching, and have the assistance of fasting; what pardon can we expect, what apology shall we make for ourselves?' By this it is plain, no day passed in Lent without a sermon to put men in mind of the great duties of Christianity, and reformation and repentance, which were more peculiar to the design of that holy season.

And frequent communions, especially on the Sabbath and the Lord's-day.

21. They had also frequent communions at this time, at least on every Sabbath and Lord's-day. For though the festivals of martyrs were not ordinarily to be celebrated in this time of humiliation, yet the Sabbath and the Lord's-day were kept as standing festivals even in Lent, as has been shown before; and therefore on these days they offered the oblation of bread and wine in the eucharist, as at other seasons. But by a canon of the Council of Laodicea[4], this oblation seems confined to those two days; for it is prohibited to offer it upon any other: and that may seem to imply, that there was no communion on any other days in Lent. But then it may be considered, that in the time of the Council of Trullo[5], there was a custom of communicating on other days in Lent upon the pre-sanctified elements, that is, such as had been consecrated the Lord's-day before. And if we can suppose this custom to have been anciently in the Church, then nothing hinders but that they might have a daily communion in Lent, as well as a daily sermon; which seems most agreeable to the fervent piety of those primitive ages: but in a doubtful matter I will not be positive, seeing there is otherwise evidence enough for

[4] C. 49. (t. 1. p. 1505 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν Τεσσαρακοστῇ ἄρτον προσφέρειν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Σαββάτῳ καὶ Κυριακῇ μόνον.

[5] C. 52. (t. 6. p. 1166 e.) Ἐν πάσαις τῆς ἁγίας Τεσσαρακοστῆς τῶν νηστειῶν ἡμέραις, παρεκτὸς τοῦ Σαββάτου καὶ Κυριακῆς, καὶ τῆς ἁγίας τοῦ Εὐαγγελισμοῦ ἡμέρας, γινέσθω ἡ τῶν προηγιασμένων ἱερὰ λειτουργία.

frequent communion in Lent, by supposing it only to be administered on every Sabbath and Lord's-day.

All public games and stage-plays prohibited at this season.

22. For the further advancement of piety and encouragement of religious assemblies at this season, all public games and stage-plays were utterly forbidden by the laws of the Church. Gothofred[6] thinks, the whole time of Lent is included in that famous law of Theodosius Junior, which prohibits all public games and shows on days of supplication, when the minds of Christians ought wholly to be employed in the worship of God. For though Lent be not expressly named in that law, yet it is comprised in the general name of 'the days of supplication.' And it is certain the Church was very solicitous to restrain men from these pleasures and diversions at this holy season. Gregory Nazianzen has a very sharp Epistle written to one of the judges[7] upon this occasion, wherein he thus rebukes him: 'You that are a judge transgress the laws in not observing the fast; and how will you observe the laws of man, who transgress and despise the laws of God? Purge the judgment seat, lest one of these two things befall you, either to be really wicked, or to be thought so. To exhibit profane shows is to make yourself a spectacle. In a word, stand corrected, O Judge, and you will sin less for the future.' St. Chrysostom, in his Lent Sermons, with equal zeal sets himself to chastise and correct this grand abuse of the holy season. He prefaces one of these Homilies[8] with this sharp invective against those that frequented the horse-races of the circus at this time. 'When I consider,' says he, 'how at one blast of the Devil ye have forgotten all my

[6] In Cod. Theod. l. 15. tit. 5. de Spectaculis, leg. 5. (t. 5. p. 354. col. sinistr.) ... Dominico tantum die, etsi hunc primum nominet, verum omnibus festis supplicationumque Christianarum diebus spectacula edi vetat: in quibus certe jejuniorum dies nonnulli fuere, quibus proinde spectacula prohibita hac lege.—See before, b. 20. ch. 2. s. 4. p. 248. n. 87.

[7] Ep. 71. al. 74. ad Celeusium. (t. 1. p. 830 a.) Παρανομεῖς ὁ δικαστὴς οὐ νηστεύων· καὶ πῶς φυλάξεις τοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους νόμους, τοὺς θείους περιφρονῶν; καθαίρου σου τὸ δικαστήριον, ἵνα μὴ δυοῖν ἓν, ἢ γίνῃ κακὸς, ἢ νομίζῃ· τὸ προτιθέναι θέας αἰσχρὰς, ἑαυτόν ἐστι θεατρίζειν· κεφάλαιον τοῦ λόγου, ἴσθι κρινόμενος ὁ δικαστὴς, καὶ ἧττον ἁμαρτήσεις.

[8] Hom. 6. in Gen. t. 2. p. 49. (t. 4. p. 39 c. p. 40 c.) Βούλομαι τῆς συνήθους ἅψασθαι διδασκαλίας, καὶ ὀκνῶ, καὶ ἀναδύομαι· νέφος γὰρ ἀθυμίας ἐπελθὸν συνέχεε καὶ συνετάραξέ μου τὸν λογισμόν· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἀθυμίας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ θυμοῦ, καὶ οὐκ οἶδ', ὅ, τι πράξω· ἀπορία γὰρ κατέχει τὴν διάνοιαν. Ὅταν γὰρ ἐννοήσω, ὅτι, μικρὸν πνεύσαντος τοῦ Διαβόλου, πᾶσαν ἡμῶν ἐκείνην τὴν συνεχῆ διδασκαλίαν, καὶ τὴν καθημερινὴν παραίνεσιν λήθῃ παραδόντες, εἰς τὴν σατανικὴν πομπὴν ἐκείνην ἅπαντες δεδραμήκατε, τὴν ἱπποδρομίαν καταλαβόντες· ποίᾳ προ-

daily admonitions and continued discourses, and run to that pomp of Satan, the horse-race in the circus, with what heart can I think of preaching to you again, who have so soon let slip all that I said before? This is what chiefly raises my grief, yea, my anger and indignation, that together with my admonition ye have cast the reverence of this holy season of Lent out of your souls, and thrown yourselves into the nets of the Devil. What profit is there in your fasting? What advantage in your meeting together so often in this place?' He pursues the same argument in the next Discourse[9], dissuading them in a very pathetical way to waive this unseasonable practice: 'Subdue, I beseech you, this wicked and pernicious custom, and consider, that they, who run to the circus, not only do much harm to themselves, but are the occasion of great scandal to others. For when the Jews and Gentiles see you, who are every day at church to hear a sermon, come notwithstanding to the horse-race, and join with them in the circus, will they not reckon our religion a cheat, and entertain the same suspicion of us all? They will sharpen their tongues against us all, and for the offence of a few condemn the whole body of Christians. Neither will they stop here, but rail at our head, and for the ser-

θυμίᾳ δυνήσομαι πάλιν τὴν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ποιήσασθαι διδασκαλίαν, τῶν προτέρων οὕτως ἀθρόον διαρρυέντων; ... Τί τῆς νηστείας ὄφελος, εἰπέ μοι; τί τῆς ἐνταῦθα συνελεύσεως τὸ κέρδος;

[9] Hom. 7. p. 61. (ibid. p. 49 b.) ... *Τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ῥαθυμίας προστριβεῖσαν ὑμῖν κηλίδα ἀπονίψασθε, περιγενόμενοι τῆς ἀκαίρου συνηθείας καὶ ἐπιβλαβοῦς, καὶ λογισάμενοι, ὡς οὐ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ δεινὸν, ὅτι ἑαυτοῖς πολλὴν τὴν βλάβην προστρίβονται οἱ αὐτόθι παραγενόμενοι· ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ πολλοῖς ἑτέροις σκανδάλου ὑπόθεσις γίνονται. Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδωσιν Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἐφ' ἑκάστης ἡμέρας εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διημερεύοντα, καὶ συνεχοῦς ἀπολαύοντα διδασκαλίας ἀθρόον ἐκεῖ φαινόμενον, καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν συμφυρόμενον, πῶς οὐ νομίσουσιν ἀπάτην εἶναι τὰ ἡμέτερα, καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόληψιν ἕξουσιν; Ἢ οὐκ ἀκούεις τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου παραινοῦντος λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ συμβουλεύοντος, Ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε; εἶτα ἵνα μὴ νομίσῃς περὶ τῶν οἰκείων μόνον τὴν παραγγελίαν παρ' αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι, καὶ τῶν μεθ' ἡμῶν τεταγμένων, προσέθηκεν, Καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἕλλησι· καὶ τότε ἐπήγαγε, Καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω λυμαίνεται καὶ βλάπτει τὴν θρησκείαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, ὡς τὸ τοῖς ἀπίστοις λαβήν τινα παρέχειν. Ὅταν οὖν ἴδωσί τινας ἐν ἀρετῇ διαλάμποντας παρ' ἡμῖν, καὶ πολλὴν τῶν βιωτικῶν ὑπεροψίαν ποιουμένους, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποπνίγονται .... ἐκπληττόμενοι, ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ὄντες οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτοῖς μετίασιν. Ἀμέλει ἐπειδὰν θεάσωνταί τινα μικρὰν ῥαθυμίαν προσγενομένην, εὐθέως τὴν γλῶτταν ἀκονοῦσι κατὰ πάντων ὁμοῦ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ῥαθυμίας κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἔθνους τὰ αὐτὰ ψηφίζονται. Καὶ οὐδὲ μέχρι τούτου ἵστανται, ἀλλ' εὐθέως κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν κεφαλῆς φθεγγόμενοι, διὰ τὴν τῶν δούλων ῥαθυμίαν καὶ τὸν κοινὸν Δεσπότην βλασφημεῖν τολμῶσι, καὶ νομίζουσι τῆς οἰκείας πλάνης παραπέτασμα αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι τὴν ἑτέρων ῥαθυμίαν.*

hands, but with almsdeeds, humanity, virtue, fasting, tears, prayers, fastings, watchings, and all kinds of piety, which they offer to Christ their Lord. And not only we, but the emperors of the world, honour this week, making it a time of vacation from all civil business, that the magistrates, being at liberty from business of the law, may spend all these days in spiritual service. Let the doors of the courts, say they, now be shut up: let all disputes and all kinds of contention and punishment cease, let the executioner's hands rest a little: common blessings are wrought for us all by our common Lord, let some good be done by us his servants. Nor is this the only honour they show to this week, but they do one thing more no less considerable. The imperial letters are sent abroad at this time, commanding all prisoners to be set at liberty from their chains. For as our Lord, when he descended into hell, set free those that were detained by death; so the servants, according to their power imitating the kindness of their Lord, loose men from their corporal bonds, when they have no power to relax the spiritual.' All this is repeated by Chrysostom in another of his Lent Sermons[13] much in the same words, which therefore it is needless to recite at length in this place: but it will not be improper to review the particulars, and confirm them by parallel passages of other writers.

It is evident the strict observation of this week was in use in

κουμένης ἁπάσης μυρίανδροι πάντοθεν ἐκκλησίαι ἐξέρχονται ἀπαντῶσαι τῷ Ἰησοῦ, οὐ βαΐα φοινίκων κατέχουσαι καὶ ἐπισείουσαι, ἀλλ' ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ ἀρετὴν, καὶ νηστείαν, καὶ δάκρυα, καὶ εὐχὰς, καὶ ἀγρυπνίας, καὶ πᾶσαν εὐλάβειαν προσφέρουσαι τῷ Δεσπότῃ Χριστῷ. Οὐχ ἡμεῖς δὲ μόνον ταύτην τιμῶμεν τὴν ἑβδομάδα, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκουμένης, οὐχ ὡς ἔτυχεν, αὐτὴν τετιμήκασιν, ἐκεχειρίαν πᾶσι δόντες τοῖς τὰ κοινὰ τῶν πόλεων πράττουσι πράγματα, ἵνα τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀπολαύσαντες σχολῆς τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας ὑπάσας τῇ πνευματικῇ προσέχωσι θεραπείᾳ. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τῶν δικαστηρίων τὰς θύρας ἀπέκλεισαν· Ἀργείτω, φησὶ, πᾶσα ἀμφισβήτησις καὶ μάχης εἶδος καὶ τιμωρίας· ἀναπαυσάσθωσαν μικρὸν τῶν δημίων αἱ χεῖρες· κοινὰ τὰ κατορθώματα τοῦ Δεσπότου γέγονε· γενέσθω δή τι καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν τῶν δούλων ἀγαθόν. Οὐ ταύτῃ δὲ μόνον αὐτὴν τετιμήκασι τῇ σπουδῇ καὶ τιμῇ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρᾳ οὐκ ἐλάττονι ταύτης· βασιλικὰ καταπέμπονται γράμματα λέγοντα, τοὺς τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντας ἀφίεσθαι τῶν δεσμῶν· καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ Δεσπότης ἡμῶν, ἐν ᾅδου γενόμενος, τοὺς κατεχομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου πάντας ἀπέλυσεν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ δοῦλοι, τὰ κατὰ δύναμιν εἰσφέροντες, καὶ τὴν Δεσποτικὴν μιμούμενοι φιλανθρωπίαν, δεσμῶν ἀπολύουσι τῶν αἰσθητῶν, ἐπειδὴ τῶν νοητῶν οὐκ ἰσχύουσι.

[13] Hom. 30. in Gen. t. 2. p. 426. (t. 4. p. 294 d.) *Καὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς, κ. τ. λ.*

the time of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, who was scholar to Origen, though with some difference according to men's ability or zeal, in observing it: for he thus speaks of it in his Canonical Epistle[14]: 'Some make a superposition of the whole six days, continuing all the time without eating; some add two days together, some three, some four, and some not one. Now to those who have borne such superpositions, continuing without sustenance, and grow unable to hold out, and are ready to faint, to them leave is to be given for an earlier refreshment. But if there be any who have been so far from superponing the preceding days, that they have not so much as kept a common fast, but it may be have feasted on them, and then coming to the two last days, Friday and the Saturday, have kept a fast of superposition on them, and think they do a great thing if they hold out till break of day: I cannot think these have striven equally with those who have been engaged in the exercise more days before.'

What meant by the fasts, called *ὑπερθέσεις* and *superpositiones, superpository* or *additional fasts* in this week.

25. It is plain from hence, that in this great week many people made an addition to the common way of fasting. For whereas in the foregoing part of Lent they took some refreshment every evening, and never fasted on the Sabbath; now they not only fasted on the Sabbath in this week, but added to it, some one day, some two, some three, some four, some five days, which they passed in perfect abstinence, eating nothing all this week till the morning of the resurrection. This kind of fasting the Greeks call *ὑπερθέσεις*, and the Latins *superpositiones, superpository* or *additional fasts*. Dionysius in the place last mentioned uses the name *ὑπερτιθέμενοι*, for those that passed the whole six days fasting. And Epiphanius[15],

[14] C. 1. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 2. part. 1. p. 3 a. (CC. t. 1. p. 836 a.) Ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τὰς ἐξ τῶν νηστειῶν ἡμέρας ἴσως μηδὲ ὁμοίως πάντες διαμένουσιν· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν καὶ πάσας ὑπερτιθέασιν ἄσιτοι διατελοῦντες, οἱ δὲ δύο, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς, οἱ δὲ τέσσαρας, οἱ δὲ οὐδεμίαν· καὶ τοῖς μὲν πάνυ διαπονηθεῖσιν ἐν ταῖς ὑπερθέσεσιν, εἶτα ἀποκαμοῦσι καὶ μονονοὺ ἐκλείπουσι, συγγνώμη τῆς ταχυτέρας γεύσεως. Εἰ δέ τινες οὐχ ὅπως ὑπερτιθέμενοι, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ νηστεύσαντες, ἢ καὶ τρυφήσαντες τὰς προαγούσας τέσσαρας, εἶτα ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὰς τελευταίας δύο καὶ μόνας ἡμέρας, αὐτὰς ὑπερτιθέντες, τήν τε Παρασκευὴν καὶ τὸ Σάββατον, μέγα τι καὶ λαμπρὸν ποιεῖν νομίζουσιν, ἂν μέχρι τῆς ἕω διαμείνωσιν· οὐκ οἶμαι τὴν ἴσην ἄθλησιν αὐτοὺς πεποιῆσθαι τοῖς τὰς πλείονας ἡμέρας προησκηκόσι.

[15] Expos. Fid. n. 23. (t. 1. p. 1105 c.) Τὰς δὲ ἐξ ἡμέρας τοῦ Πάσχα ἐν ξηροφαγίᾳ διατελοῦσι πάντες οἱ λαοί· φημὶ δὲ ἄρτῳ, καὶ ἁλὶ, καὶ ὕδατι τότε χρώμενοι πρὸς ἑσπέραν· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ σπουδαῖοι διπλὰς καὶ τριπλὰς

speaking of the manner of observing the same six days, says, 'all the people kept them *ἐν ξηροφαγίᾳ, living on dry meats*, namely, bread and salt and water, which they only used at evening: and they that were more zealous superadded two, three, and four days, and some the whole week, till cock-crowing on Sunday morning.' Where we may observe two sorts of additions made to the common fast in this week above others: first, that they confined themselves to the use of dry meats only, which they did not generally in the former part of Lent; and, secondly, that they continued their fast for several days together without any sustenance, some passing over the whole six days in this rigorous way without any abatement. And so Epiphanius represents it in another place[16], where he speaks of the manner of observing the holy week of the Pasch: 'Some continued the whole week *ὑπερτιθέμενοι, making one continued fast of the whole;* others eat after two days, and others every evening.' This was otherwise called *ἐπισυνάπτειν*, and *jejunia conjungere et continuare*, as we find in Sozomen and Tertullian. For Sozomen[17], speaking of Spyridion's way of observing the great Paschal week, says, 'at that time he was used with his whole family *ἐπισυνάπτειν τὴν νηστείαν, to join one day of fasting to another*, and only eat at a certain day, continuing without any food all the days between.' And this in Tertullian's phrase[18] is *jejunia conjungere, to join one day of fasting to another;* and *Sabbatum continuare cum jejuniis*

καὶ τετραπλὰς ὑπερτίθενται, καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἑβδομάδα τινὲς ἄχρι ἀλεκτρυόνων κλάγγης, τῆς Κυριακῆς ἐπιφωσκούσης. —Conf. Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 18. [al. 17.] (Cotel. v. 1. p. 322.) *Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις οὖν τοῦ Πάσχα νηστεύετε, ἀρχόμενοι ἀπὸ δευτέρας μέχρι τῆς Παρασκευῆς, καὶ Σαββάτου, ἐξ ἡμέρας, μόνῳ χρώμενοι ἄρτῳ, καὶ ἁλὶ, καὶ λαχάνοις, καὶ ποτῷ ὕδατι· οἴνου δὲ καὶ κρεῶν ἀπέχεσθε ἐν ταύταις· ἡμέραι γάρ εἰσι πένθους, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἑορτῆς. Τὴν μέν τοι Παρασκευὴν καὶ τὸ Σάββατον ὁλόκληρον νηστεύσατε, οἷς δύναμις πρόσεστι τοιαύτη, μηδενὸς γενόμενοι μέχρις ἀλεκτοροφωνίας νυκτός. Εἰ δέ τις ἀδυνατεῖ τὰς δύο συνάπτειν ὁμοῦ, φυλασσέσθω κἂν τὸ Σάββατον· λέγει γάρ που ὁ Κύριος περὶ ἑαυτοῦ φάσκων, Ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. Ἐν ταύταις οὖν ᾔρθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν ὑπὸ τῶν ψευδωνύμων Ἰουδαίων, καὶ σταυρῷ προσεπάγη, καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.*

[16] Hær. 29. Nazar. n. 5. (t. 1. p. 120 c.) *Ὡς τινες ἑβδομάδα τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν Πάσχων ὑπερτιθέμενοι διετέλουν, ἄλλοι δὲ διὰ δύο ἐσθίοντες, ἄλλοι δὲ καὶ καθ' ἑσπέραν.*

[17] L. 1. c. 11. See before, s. 17. p. 413. n. 89.

[18] De Patient. c. 13. (p. 147 c.) In primis afflictatio carnis, hostia Domino placatoria per humiliationis sacrificium, cum sordes cum angustia victus Domino libat, contenta simplici pabulo puroque aquæ potu, cum jejunia conjungit, cum cineri et sacco inolescit.

Parasceues[19], *to make Friday and Saturday in the Passion-week one continued fast.* This was an exercise which many of those who followed the ascetic life used at other times: for Evagrius[20], speaking of the monks of Palestine, says, 'they observed *τὰς καλουμένας ὑπερθεσίμους, those called superpository fasts,* continuing them for two or three days, and some for five days together.' This in the Latin writers is called *superpositio jejunii:* as in the Fragment of Victorinus Petavionensis[21], published by Dr. Cave, where he speaks of the several sorts of fasts observed among Christians, some of which were only till the ninth hour, some till evening, and some with a superposition or addition of one fasting-day to another. Though we must note, that superposition of a fast is not always taken in this sense, but sometimes denotes a new appointed fast of any kind, though it had nothing extraordinary but only the newness of the imposition in it, as we find in the Council of Eliberis[22], of which more hereafter in its proper place, [in the sixth section of the next chapter.]

Of their several sorts of abstinence.

25*. Valesius[23], in his Notes upon Eusebius, speaks of three kinds of fasts among them. The first called *jejunium nonæ,*

[19] De Jejun. c. 14. (p. 552 b.) Cur stationibus quartam et sextam sabbati dicemus et jejuniis Parasceuen? quanquam vos etiam Sabbatum, si quando continuatis, nunquam nisi in Pascha jejunandum secundum rationem alibi redditam, &c.—Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 5. c. 18. See n. 15, preceding.

[20] L. 1. c. 21. (v. 3. p. 277. 9.) Οἱ πολλάκις μὲν καὶ τὰς καλουμένας ὑπερθεσίμους πράττουσι, διήμεροι καὶ τριήμεροι τὰς νηστείας ἐκτελοῦντες· εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ πεμπταῖοι, ἢ καὶ πρὸς, κ. τ. λ.

[21] De Fabrica Mundi, ap. Cave Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 103.) Ratio veritatis ostenditur, ... quare usque ad horam nonam jejunamus, usque ad vesperam, aut superpositio usque in alterum diem fiat.

[22] C. 23. (t. 1. p. 973 c.) Jejuniorum superpositiones per singulos menses placuit celebrari, exceptis diebus duorum mensium Julii et Augusti, ob quorundam infirmitatem.—C. 26. (ibid. d.) Errorem placuit corrigi, ut omni Sabbati die superpositiones celebremus.

[23] [In Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (v. 1. p. 246. n. 2.) Tres apud veteres Christianos fuere jejunii species. Primum fuit jejunium quartæ et sextæ feriæ, quod solvebatur hora diei nona post finem stationis seu *συνάξεως.* Quare a Tertulliano vocantur *stationum semijejunia.* In Typico monasterii Sancti Sabæ dicitur *νηστεία τῆς ἐννάτης.* Secunda species fuit jejunium Quadragesimale, quod sub vesperam solvebatur. Nam hora nona fiebat synaxis, et post missarum solemnia vespertinum canebatur officium, ac deinde populus dimittebatur, ut do-

* [This supplemental section is introduced from a manuscript addition by the Author himself, inserted in his private copy of his own work, with a view to the new edition which he contemplated, but did not live to complete. I have marked it 25*, so as not to disarrange the numbers of the sections in other editions. Ed.]

because it held only till *nine o'clock*, that is, *three in the afternoon*, and was proper to the weekly assemblies on Wednesdays and Fridays, or the stationary days on which they celebrated the communion, and therefore was also called *jejunium quartæ*, and *sextæ feriæ*, and *semi-jejunium stationum*. The second was the Quadragesimal fast, which even held till the evening. The third he calls *jejunium ὑπερθέσεως*, or *superpositionis*, *a superabundant fast*, which held till cock-crowing or break of day, and was proper to the Paschal week before Easter. But, as that learned person enumerates and explains, his account is imperfect. For here is no notice taken of the *xerophagia*, which he himself owns to be mentioned by Tertullian: and then the explication given of the *ὑπέρθεσις*, or *superpositio*, though true, is not complete, because it signifies other kind of fasts than what he mentions. I shall therefore give a more distinct account both of several kinds and several days of fasting.

The first kind of fast was abstinence from all meat till evening. This was properly and absolutely called *jejunium* and *jejunium perfectum*. Next to this was the *semi-jejunium* or *statio*, which belonged to Wednesdays and Fridays, and ended at nine o'clock, or three in the afternoon. This was commonly called the half-fast, because it ended before night, and might be kept together with the reception of the holy communion, which was never allowed upon a perfect fast day. It had the name *statio*[24] from its imitation of military discipline. That it ended at nine o'clock appears from Tertullian[25]: and this was the quarrel betwixt him and the *Psychici*[26], as he there calls the Catholics, 'that the Catholics

cent Epiphanius, Amalarius, et Concilia Anglicana. Tertium genus fuit omnium strictissimum, quod usque ad galli cantum et primæ lucis exortum producebatur: quod idcirco *ὑπέρθεσις* dicebatur, Latine *superpositio*. Hæc tria genera, &c.

[24] Vid. Tertull. de Orat. c. 14. (p. 136 a.) Si statio de militari exemplo nomen accipit: nam et militia Dei sumus.

[25] De Jejun. c. 2. (p. 545 a.) where speaking of the stations, he says,... Quando et orationes fere hora nona concludat de Petri exemplo, quod Actis 10. refertur.

[26] Ibid. c. 10. (p. 549 b.) Æque stationes nostras ut indignas, quasdam vero et in serum constitutas, novitatis nomine incusant, hoc quoque munus, et ex arbitrio obeundum esse dicentes, et non ultra nonam detinendum de suo scilicet more.—Ibid. c. 10. ad fin., speaking of the Montanists: Hæc erit statio sera, quæ ad vesperam jejunans pinguiorem orationem Deo immolat.—C. 1. (p. 544 b.) Arguunt nos [Psychici], quod stationes plerumque in vesperam producamus. Ed.]

would always end their stations at nine o'clock, whereas he and the Montanists continued them till evening.'

26. The next addition mentioned by Chrysostom as made in the spiritual exercise and observation of this week, is their more liberal distribution of alms to the poor, and exercise of all kinds of charity to those that stood in need of it. For the nearer they approached to the passion and resurrection of Christ, by which all the blessings in the world were poured forth upon men, the more they thought themselves obliged to show all manner of acts of mercy and kindness toward their brethren.

Christians more liberal in their alms and charity during passion-week above others.

27. Particularly this week before Easter and the following week was a time of rest and liberty to servants. Many in great charity had their freedom granted them, in imitation of the spiritual liberty which Christ at this time had procured for all mankind. This is clear from what has been shown before[27] out of Gregory Nyssen and the laws of Theodosius, which allow all juridical acts done in favour of slaves in the fifteen days of the Paschal solemnity, in which both the Pasch of the cross and the Pasch of the resurrection are equally included. Both these weeks likewise were equally set apart for divine service: and for that reason all servants had a vacation from their ordinary bodily labour, that they might have more leisure and opportunity to attend the worship of God and concerns of their souls. The author of the Constitutions[28], in conformity to this custom, which he found in the practice of the Church, gives this direction: 'In the whole great week before Easter, and the week following, let servants rest from their labour; because the one is the time of our Lord's passion, and the other of his resurrection; and servants have need to be instructed in the knowledge of those mysteries.'

This week a week of rest and liberty for servants.

28. That particular sort of charity which Chrysostom speaks of as shown by the emperors to all prisoners, as well criminals as debtors, in granting them a general release out of prison at this season, is demonstrated from the imperial laws still in being: for they are said to grant this indulgence with a parti-

A general release granted at this time by the emperors to all prisoners, both debtors and

[27] B. 20. ch. 5. ss. 6 and 7. pp. 318, seqq.

[28] L. 8. c. 33. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 414.) *Τὴν μεγάλην ἑβδομάδα πᾶσαν καὶ τὴν μετ' αὐτὴν ἀργείτωσαν οἱ δοῦλοι· ὅτι ἡ μὲν πάθους ἐστὶν, ἡ δὲ ἀναστάσεως· καὶ χρεία διδασκαλίας, τίς ὁ παθὼν καὶ ἀναστὰς, ἢ τίς ὁ συγχωρήσας.*

criminals, some particular cases of criminals only excepted.

cular respect to the Paschal solemnity, which includes as well the great week before as the week following Easter day[28]. And so not only Chrysostom, but St. Ambrose[29] understood it, when he said, 'the holy days of the last week in Lent was the time when the bonds of debtors used to be loosed.' Wherefore whatever has been said before[30] of this indulgence as belonging to the Easter festival, is so to be understood as belonging to this holy and great week of our Saviour's passion, when these indulgences first commenced, and continued in force till the whole festival was ended.

All processes at law, as well civil as criminal, suspended this whole week before Easter.

29. What Chrysostom says further of the emperors commanding all suits and processes at law to cease in this great week, and the tribunal doors to be shut up, is taken from the express words of the law of Theodosius, still extant in both the Codes. For these, appointing what days shall be exempted from juridical actions[31], expressly mention the fifteen days of the Paschal solemnity, the week preceding and the week following Easter. St. Austin[32] speaks of the same: and Scaliger[33] mentions a law of Constantine, wherein he had made a like decree, 'that the two Paschal weeks, the one immediately before, and the other following Easter, should be exempted from all business of the law.' The design of which was, that nothing of animosity, or contention, or cruelty, or punishment, or bloodshed should appear at this holy season, when all men were labouring to obtain mercy and pardon by the blood of Christ; and that men sequestering themselves from all civil and worldly business, might with greater assiduity attend the exercises of piety, which were peculiar to the solemn occasion.

The Thursday in this week how observed.

30. The Thursday in this week, which was the day on which Christ was betrayed, and instituted the communion at his last supper, was observed with some peculiar customs. For on

[28] Vid. Cod. Theod. l. 9. tit. 38. de Indulgentiis Criminum, legg. 3. et 4. See before, b. 20. ch. 5. s. 6. p. 318. n. 60.

[29] Ep. 33. [al. 20.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 853 d. n. 6.) Itaque sanctis diebus hebdomadis ultimæ, quibus solebant debitorum laxari vincula, &c.

[30] See before, b. 20. ch. 5. s. 6. p. 318.

[31] Cod. Theod. l. 2. tit. 8. de Feriis, leg. 2. (t. 1. p. 121.) Sanctos quoque Paschæ dies, qui septeno vel præcedunt numero, vel sequuntur, in eadem observatione numeramus.

[32] Serm. 19. ex 40. a Sirmond. edit. See b. 20. ch. 5. s. 1. p. 300. n. 5.

[33] De Emendatione Temporum, l. 7. See ibid. n. 6.

this day, in some of the Latin Churches, the communion was administered in the evening after supper, in imitation of the communion of the Apostles at our Lord's last supper. As we find by a provision made in one of the canons of the third Council of Carthage[34], 'that the sacrament of the altar should always be received by men fasting, except on one anniversary day, when the Lord's last supper was solemnly commemorated.' St. Austin[35] takes notice of the same custom, and withal observes, that the communion in some places was administered twice on this day; in the morning for the sake of such as could not keep the day a fast, and in the evening for those that fasted till evening, when they ended their fast, and received the communion after supper. He likewise tells us there was a particular reason why many could not fast upon this day, and therefore they received the communion in the morning: for it was customary with many who had kept Lent to bathe and wash their bodies on this day, as the catechumens did, in order to appear decently, pure and clean from the filth which their bodies might have contracted by the austerities of Lent, when they came to be baptized on the vigil, or night between the great Sabbath and Easter-day: they could not bear both bathing and fasting, and therefore they fasted not on this day, but received the communion in the morning, and ate their dinner as at other times; whilst others fasted all the day, and received the communion after supper.

On this day the *competentes*, or *candidates of baptism*, publicly rehearsed the Creed before the bishop or presbyters in the church, as we learn from the Council of Laodicea[36],

[34] C. 29. juxt. Ed. Crabb. (t. 1. p. 428.) Item. apud Cod. Afric. c. 41. Latine. (Labb. t. 2. p. 1069 c.) Ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur, excepto uno die anniversario, quo cœna Domini [al. Dominica] celebratur.

[35] Ep. 118. [sl. 54.] ad Januar. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 127 c.) Sed nonnullos probabilis quædam ratio delectavit, ut uno certo die per annum, quo ipsam cœnam Dominus dedit, tanquam ad insigniorem commemorationem post cibos offerri et accipi liceat corpus et sanguinem Domini. Honestius autem arbitror ea hora fieri, ut qui etiam jejunaverit, post refectionem, quæ hora nona fit, ad oblationem possit occurrere. Quapropter neminem cogimus ante Dominicam illam cœnam prandere, sed nulli etiam contradicere audemus. Hoc tamen non arbitror institutum, nisi quia plures et prope omnes in plerisque locis eo die lavare consuerunt. Et quia nonnulli etiam jejunium custodiunt, mane offertur propter prandentes, quia jejunia simul et lavacra tolerare non possunt, ad vesperam vero propter jejunantes.

[36] C. 46. (t. 1. p. 1504 e.) Ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς φωτιζομένους τὴν πίστιν ἐκμαν-

which fixes this rehearsal to the fifth day of the great week; and from Theodorus Lector[37], who says, 'Timotheus bishop of Constantinople was the first that ordered the Creed to be recited in every church-assembly, which before was used to be repeated only once a year by the catechumens on the *Parasceue*, or *preparation to our Saviour's passion*, when the bishop was wont to catechize them.

On this day it was customary for servants to receive the communion, as we find in Joannes Moschus[38], who tells us a remarkable story of one who laid up the eucharist in his chest which he had brought home from church with him, *τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ πέμπτῃ, on this great and holy fifth day of the Passion-week;* under which name we find it also in the title of one of Chrysostom's Sermons upon this day[39], *Τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ Πεντάδι.* The modern ritualists call it *Maundy Thursday, Dies Mandati*, because on this day our Saviour washed his disciples' feet, and *gave them commandment* to follow his example[40]; or because he instituted the sacrament of his supper upon this day, *commanding* his disciples to do the same in remembrance of him, as others[41] expound it.

But the Pope's custom of excommunicating all people and princes, that are enemies to the Roman Church, on this day, and among the rest the King of Spain for invading the rights of the Church[42], (whom he absolves again without asking any

θάνειν, καὶ τῇ πέμπτῃ τῆς ἑβδομάδας ἀπαγγέλλειν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις.

37 L. 2. (v. 3. p. 578. 17.) *Τιμόθεος τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ πατέρων τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον, κατ' ἑκάστην σύναξιν λέγεσθαι παρεσκεύασεν, ἐπὶ διαβολῇ δῆθεν Μακεδονίου, ὡς αὐτοῦ μὴ δεχομένου τὸ σύμβολον, ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους λεγόμενον πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ Παρασκευῇ τοῦ Θείου πάθους, τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γινομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου κατηχήσεων.*

38 Prat. Spirit. c. 79. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 2. p. 1089 d. 7.) *Ἔχων δὲ πιστικὸν κοινωνοῦντα τῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· οὗτος ὁ πιστικὸς, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς χώρας, ἔλαβεν κοινωνίαν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πέμπτῃ· καὶ βαλὼν αὐτὴν ἐν μουζικίῳ ἀπέθετο ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀρμαρίῳ, κ. τ. λ.*

39 Hom. 30. [Bened. Hom. 1.] de Proditione Judæ. t. 5. p. 453. (t. 2. p. 376.) *Εἰς τὴν παραδοσίαν τοῦ Ἰούδα, καὶ εἰς τὸ Πάσχα, καὶ εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν μυστηρίων, καὶ περὶ τοῦ μὴ μνησικακεῖν· τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ πεντάδι.*

40 See Bp. Sparrow's Rationale on the Common Prayer, p. 135. (Reprint, 1839, p. 125.) This day Christ washed his disciples' feet, and gave them a commandment to do likewise. Hence it is called *Dies Mandati, Mandate* or *Maunday Thursday.*

41 See L'Estrange, Alliance of Divine Offices, p. 142. (Reprint, p. 209.) This day was anciently called, &c.

42 See Du Moulin, Buckler of Faith, (p. 370.) Our Kings and their officers, and Courts of Parliament,

pardon on Good Friday;) as it is a grand ridicule and mock of church-discipline, so it is without all foundation in the practice of the ancient Church.

Of the Passion-day, or the Pasch of our Lord's crucifixion.

31. Some with greater probability suppose that such public penitents as had completed their penance for one, two, three years or more, the Lent preceding, (for the years of penance were usually reckoned from Easter to Easter,) were absolved on this day. At least it is certain they were reconciled either on this or the day following. For St. Ambrose [43] says very expressly, 'that the day of relaxation of penance in the Church was the day on which our Lord gave himself for us:' which must mean either the day on which he was betrayed by Judas, or the day of his passion, when he offered himself a sacrifice for the sins of mankind; that is the *Parasceue*, or *Good Friday*, or *the Pasch*, as it is often called, meaning *the Pasch of the Cross*, Πάσχα Σταυρώσιμον, in opposition to the Πάσχα Ἀναστάσιμον, or *Pasch of the Resurrection*. Nor was it only particular absolutions that were granted to public penitents on this day of the passion, but a general absolution or indulgence was proclaimed to all the people observing the day with fasting, prayers, and true contrition or compunction. As we find in the fourth Council of Toledo, which makes a complaint, that in some of the Spanish Churches the day of the Lord's passion was not regularly observed: for the church doors were shut up, and no divine service performed: wherefore they order [44], 'that the mystery of the cross should be preached on this day, and that all the people should wait for the indulgence or absolution, that, being cleansed by the compunction of repentance and remission of sins, they might worthily celebrate the vene-

are dealt with in the like unjust manner in the Bull *De Cœna Domini*, which is a solemn excommunication, which the Pope thundereth out every year on Maundy Thursday before Easter: .... wherein he nameth ... emperors, kings, dukes, ... who shall appeal from the Pope to any future Council.

[43] Ep. 33. [al. Ep. 20.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 859 b. n. 26.) Erat autem dies quo sese Dominus pro nobis tradidit, quo in ecclesia pœnitentia relaxatur.

[44] C. 6. [al. 7.] (t. 5. p. 1707 d.) .... Oportet eodem die mysterium crucis, quod ipse Dominus cunctis nuntiandum voluit, prædicari, atque indulgentiam criminum clara voce omnem populum præstolari [al. postulare]: ut pœnitentiæ compunctione mundati venerabile festum [al. venerabilem diem] Dominicæ resurrectionis remissis iniquitatibus suscipere mereamur; corporisque ejus et sanguinis sacramentum mundi a peccato [al. peccatis] sumamus.

rable feast of the Lord's resurrection, and come pure and clean to partake of the sacrament of his body and blood.' They further condemn such as ended their fast on this day at the ninth hour, and order[45], 'that all, except little children, old men, and the sick, should spend the whole day in abstinence and mourning, and not give over their fast, *ante peractas indulgentiæ preces, before the prayers of absolution were ended.*' Whence it may be inferred that this absolution was the close of the public service of this day, which whoever did not attend was to be denied the communion on Easter day, 'because,' as the canon words it, 'he paid not a due respect by abstinence to the passion of his Lord.' Indeed this day, as we have seen before, was one of those two great days which all Christians in general thought themselves obliged strictly to observe: even they who kept no other Lent religiously observed these, as the days on which the Bridegroom was taken from them: and that seems to be the reason why this canon treats those with a little more severity who neglected the day of our Saviour's passion, because they contemned the general custom and observation of Christians.

Of the Saturday or Great Sabbath before Easter.

32. The Saturday or Sabbath in this week was commonly known by the name of *the Great Sabbath*, as we find it termed in Chrysostom and others[46]. It had many peculiarities belonging to it. For this was the only Sabbath throughout the year that the Greek Churches and some of the Western kept as a fast. All other Sabbaths even in Lent were observed as festivals together with the Lord's-day, as has been shown several times before: but this *Great Sabbath* was observed as a most solemn fast, which some joined with the fast of the preceding day, and made them both but one continued fast of superposition; and they who could not thus join both days

[45] C. 7. [al. 8.] (ibid. d.] Quidam in die ejusdem Dominicæ passionis ad horam nonam jejunium solvunt, conviviis adhibentur [al. abutuntur], et dum sol ipse eodem die tenebris palliatus lumen subduxerit, ipsaque elementa turbata mœstitiam totius mundi ostenderint, illi jejunium tanti diei polluunt, epulisque inserviunt. Et quia totum eundem diem universalis ecclesia propter passionem Domini in mœrore et abstinentia peragit; quicunque in eo jejunium, præter parvulos, senes, et languidos, ante peractas indulgentiæ preces, resolverit, a Paschali gaudio repellatur, nec in eo sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Domini percipiat, qui diem passionis ipsius per abstinentiam non honoravit [al. honorat].

[46] Vid. Pallad. Vit. Chrysost., et Chrysost. Ep. 1. ad Innocent. See nn. 50 and 58, following.

together without some refreshment, yet observed the Saturday with great strictness, holding out their fast till after midnight, or cock-crowing in the morning. Thus we find it ordered in the Constitutions[45], conformable to the practice of the Church: 'Let as many as are able fast the Friday and the Sabbath throughout, eating nothing till cock-crowing in the morning: but if any cannot *τὰς δύο συνάπτειν ὁμοῦ*, *join both days together* in one continued fast, let him however keep the Sabbath a fast: for the Lord speaking of himself said, "When the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, in those days shall they fast."' So this day was kept an universal fast over the whole Church: and they continued it not only till evening but till cock-crowing in the morning, which was the supposed time of our Saviour's resurrection. The preceding time of the night was spent in a vigil or pernoctation, when they assembled together to perform all parts of divine service, psalmody, and reading the Scripture, the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, praying, and preaching, and baptizing such of their catechumens as presented themselves to baptism: all which acts are particularly mentioned by the author of the Constitutions[46] in his description of the Paschal vigil.

The account of the several vigils observed in the Church has been given in a former Book[47]: here I only take notice of this one, which was the most famous of all others between the Great Sabbath and Easter day. Of which there is frequent mention made in the ancient writers, Chrysostom[48], Epiphanius[49], Palladius[50], Gregory Nyssen[51], and many others.

[45] L. 5. c. 18. See before, s. 25. n. 15, preceding.

[46] L. 5. c. 19. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 323.) *Τῷ δὲ Σαββάτῳ μέχρις ἀλεκτοροφωνίας παρατείνοντες ἀπονηστίζεσθε, ἐπιφωσκούσης μιᾶς σαββάτων, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ Κυριακή, ἀπὸ ἑσπέρας ἕως ἀλεκτοροφωνίας ἀγρυπνοῦντες· καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ συναθροιζόμενοι γρηγορεῖτε, προσευχόμενοι καὶ δεόμενοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν τῇ διανυκτερεύσει ὑμῶν· ἀναγινώσκοντες τὸν Νόμον, τοὺς Προφήτας, τοὺς Ψαλμοὺς, μέχρις ἀλεκτρυόνων κραυγῆς· καὶ βαπτίσαντες ὑμῶν τοὺς κατηχουμένους, καὶ ἀναγνόντες τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἐν φόβῳ καὶ τρόμῳ, καὶ προσλαλήσαντες τῷ λαῷ τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν, παύσασθε τοῦ πένθους ὑμῶν.*

[47] B. 13. ch. 9. s. 4. v. 4. p. 529.

[48] Hom. 30. in. Gen. p. 426. [*Nihil hic invenio*, says Grischovius (v. 9. p. 239.) *de isto præcipue pervigilio: pag. autem* 424. (*p.* 329. *Edit. Frf.*) *habentur quædam de vigiliis magnæ hebdomadis in genere.* See before, b. 13. ch. 9. s. 4. v. 4. p. 532. n. 44., which is probably the passage the learned Author had in view. Ed.]—Conf. Ep. 1. ad Innocent. See n. 58, following.

[49] Expos. Fid. n. 22. (t. 1. p. 1105 c.) *Ἐν τισι δὲ τόποις τὴν μετὰ τὴν πέμπτην ἀγρυπνοῦσιν, ἐπιφώσκουσαν*

Particularly Lactantius and St. Jerom tell us, they observed it upon a double account. 'This is the night,' says Lactantius[52], 'which we observe with a pernoctation (or watching all the night) for the advent of our King and God: of which night there is a twofold reason to be given, because in this night our Lord was raised to life again after his passion; and in the same he is expected to return to receive the kingdom of the world,' (that is, to come to judgment.) St. Jerom[53] says, 'it was a tradition among the Jews that Christ would come at midnight, as he did upon the Egyptians at the time of the Passover: and thence,' he thinks, 'the apostolical custom came, not to dismiss the people on the Paschal vigil before midnight, expecting the coming of Christ: after which time, presuming upon security, they kept the day a festival.' Eusebius[54] says,

εἰς τὸ Προσάββατον, *καὶ τὴν* Κυριακὴν *μόνας.*

[50] Vit. Chrysost. c. 4. (ap. Oper. Chrysost. t. 13. p. 33 b.) *Ἐν τούτοις ἐπέστη ἡ τοῦ μεγάλου σαββάτου ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ὁ* Σωτὴρ *σταυρωθεὶς ἐσκύλευσεν τὸν ᾅδην. . . . Οἱ μέντοι πρεσβύτεροι* Ἰωάννου, *οἱ τὸν θεῖον ἔχοντες φόβον, ἐν τῷ δημοσίῳ λούτρῳ τῷ ἐπικαλουμένῳ* Κωνσταντιναῖς, *τοὺς λαοὺς συναγαγόντες, εἶχοντο τὰς ἀγρυπνίας· οἱ μὲν τὰ θεῖα λόγια ἀναγινώσκοντες· οἱ δὲ βαπτίζοντες τοὺς κατηχηθέντας, ὡς εἰκὸς διὰ τὸ* Πάσχα.

[51] Orat. in Resurrect. Domini. [*Vaga allegatio*, observes Grischovius, *Nyssenus quinque habet Orationes de hoc argumento, quarum priores tres bene longæ sunt, quas lector ipse, si volet, evolvat.*—I think my learned Ancestor referred to the introductory sentences of the fourth of those Orations, *De Sancto et Salutari Festo Paschæ*, where Nyssen alludes to the previous night, as passed in praying, preaching, and singing, while the continuous burning of the lamps had dispelled the darkness, and joined by their artificial light the two days of the Vigil and the Festival, as it were, into one. (Oper. t. 2. p. 435 d. 9. et p. 436 d. 10.). . . *Ὁ δὲ παννύχιος ταῖς ἀκοαῖς προσηχῶς λόγος, ἐν ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς, οἷον ῥεῦμα χαρᾶς, δι' ἀκοῆς εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν εἰσρέων, πλήρεις ἡμᾶς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐλπίδων ἐποίησεν· κ. τ. λ.* And a little afterwards . . . *Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν φωτινὴ νὺξ αὕτη, τὰς ἐκ τῶν λαμπάδων αὐγὰς ὀρθριναῖς ἀκτῖσι τοῦ ἡλίου συμμίξασα, μίαν κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς ἡμέραν ἐποίησεν, κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[52] Instit. l. 7. c. 19. (t. 1. p. 569.) Hæc est nox, quæ a nobis propter adventum Regis ac Dei nostri pervigilio celebratur: cujus noctis duplex ratio est, quod in ea et vitam tum recepit, cum passus est; et postea orbis terræ regnum receptur us est.

[53] In Matth. 25. 6. (t. 7. p. 203 c.) Traditio Judæorum est, Christum media nocte venturum, in similitudinem Ægyptii temporis, quando Pascha celebratum est, et exterminator venit, et Dominus super tabernacula transiit, et sanguine agni postes nostrarum frontium consecratæ sunt. Unde reor et traditionem apostolicam permansisse, ut in die vigiliarum Paschæ, ante noctis dimidium populos dimittere non liceat expectantes adventum Christi. Et postquam illud tempus transierit, securitate præsumpta, festum cuncti agunt diem.

[54] De Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 22. (v. 1. p. 637. 11.) *Τὴν δὲ ἱερὰν διανυκτέρευσιν μετέβαλλεν εἰς ἡμερινὰ φῶτα, κηροῦ κίονας ὑψηλοτάτους καθ' ὅλης ἐξαπτόντων τῆς πόλεως τῶν ἐπὶ*

in the time of Constantine this vigil was kept with great pomp: 'for he set up lofty pillars of wax to burn as torches all over the city, and lamps burning in all places, so that the night seemed to outshine the sun at noon-day.' Nazianzen[55] also speaks of this custom of setting up lamps and torches both in the churches and their own private houses: which, he says, 'they did as a *prodromus* or *forerunner* of that great Light, the Sun of Righteousness, arising on the world on Easter-day.' Tertullian[56] intimates, that this vigil was solemnly kept in his time by all sorts of people, by women as well as men: for writing against the marriage of Christian women with Heathens, among other arguments he puts this question to them, to dissuade them from such dangerous engagements: 'What unbelieving husband will be content to let his wife be absent from him all night at the celebration of the Paschal vigil?' And it is plain from Socrates[57] that the sectaries as well as the Catholics had this night in great veneration: for it was upon one of these Paschal vigils that the Sabbatians, who were a subdivision of the Novatian schismatics, 'were seized with such a panic terror in the night, that, flying in a strange confusion through a straight passage from the place where they were met, they pressed so hard upon one another, that threescore and ten of them were trodden to death.'

τούτῳ τεταγμένων· λαμπάδες δ' ἦσαν πυρὸς, πάντα φωτίζουσαι τόπον· ὡς λαμπρᾶς ἡμέρας τηλαυγεστέραν τὴν μυστικὴν διανυκτέρευσιν ἀποτελεῖσθαι. —C. 57. (ibid. p. 659. 2.) *Ἤδη δ' ἡ μεγάλη τοῦ Πάσχα ἑορτὴ παρῆν· ἐν ᾗ ὁ βασιλεὺς, τῷ Θεῷ τὰς εὐχὰς ἀποδιδοὺς, συνδιεννυκτέρευσε τοῖς ἄλλοις.*

[55] Orat. 42. de Pasch. (t. 1. p. 676 d.) *Καλὴ μὲν ἡ χθὲς ἡμῖν λαμπροφορία καὶ φωταγωγία, ἣν ἰδίᾳ τε καὶ δημοσίᾳ συνεστησάμεθα· πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων μικροῦ, καὶ ἀξία πᾶσα, δαψιλεῖ τῷ πυρὶ τὴν νύκτα καταφωτίζοντες, καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου φωτὸς ἀντίτυπος· ὅσον τε οὐρανὸς ἄνωθεν φρυκτωρεῖ, κόσμον ὅλων [ὅλον] αὐγάζων τοῖς παρ' ἑαυτοῦ κάλλεσι, καὶ ὅσον ὑπερουρίνιον, ἔν τε ἀγγέλοις τῇ πρώτῃ φωτεινῇ φύσει μετὰ τὴν πρώτην τῷ ἐκεῖθεν πηγάζεσθαι, καὶ ὅσον ἐν τῇ τριάδι, παρ' ἧς φῶς ἅπαν συνέστηκεν ἐξ ἀμερίστου φωτὸς μεριζόμενον καὶ τιμώμενον. Καλλίων δὲ ἡ σήμερον καὶ περιφανεστέρα· ὅσῳ χθὲς μὲν πρόδρομον ἦν τοῦ μεγάλου φωτὸς ἀνισταμένου τὸ φῶς, καὶ οἷον εὐφροσύνη τις προεόρτιος· σήμερον δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτὴν ἑορτάζομεν, οὐκ ἔτι ἐλπιζομένην, ἀλλ' ἤδη γεγεννημένην, καὶ κόσμον ὅλον ἑαυτῇ συνάγουσαν.*

[56] Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. 4. (p. 168 d.) Quis denique solemnibus Paschæ abnoctantem securus substinebit?

[57] L. 7. c. 5. (v. 2. p. 351. 3.)... *Μετ' οὐ πολὺ γὰρ τὴν ἐκ προλήψεως ἑορτὴν ἐπετέλει [ὁ Σαββάτιος]· καὶ συνέρρεον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξ ἔθους πολλοί· καὶ, τὴν ἐξ ἔθους παννυχίδα ποιούντων, θόρυβός τις δαιμόνιος· ἐνέπεσεν εἰς αὐτοὺς, ὡς ἄρα Σισίννιος ὁ αὐτῶν ἐπίσκοπος σὺν πολλῷ πλήθει ἔρχεται κατ' αὐτῶν· καὶ ταραχῆς γενομένης, οἷα εἰκὸς, ἐν νυκτὶ καὶ στενῷ τόπῳ ἀπληφθέντες, ἑαυτοὺς συνέτριψαν· ὡς ἀπολέσθαι ἐξ αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα ἀνθρώπους.*

This night was famous above all others for baptizing of catechumens; as we learn not only from the general account given of the ancient time of baptizing, as fixed chiefly to the Paschal solemnity: but more particularly from those sad relations made by St. Chrysostom[58] and Palladius[59] of the barbarous invasion of Chrysostom's church, and the assaults made upon him, and his clergy and people, as they were assembled together this night to keep the Paschal vigil, and baptize the catechumens. Where, among other grievous acts of hostility, they take notice of this one unparalleled instance of indecent cruelty, 'that the enemy forced the women catechumens, who were divested in order to baptism, to fly away naked, and slew many of them in the very baptisteries, making the holy fonts swim with blood.' And yet in this one night, notwithstanding the tumult, three thousand persons were baptized; as is particularly noted by Palladius[60], from whence it is easy to conclude that this night was a celebrated time of baptism; and that as the penitents were restored the day before to the communion which they had lost, so on this day the catechumens were made complete Christians, and admitted to the communion which

[58] Ep. 1. ad Innocent. t. 4. p. 680. (t. 3. p. 518 e.) Ἡμῶν γὰρ αὐτὰ, καθάπερ ἔμπροσθεν εἶπον, προτεινόντων, ἀθρόον στρατιωτικὸν πλῆθος αὐτῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ σαββάτῳ, πρὸς ἑσπέραν λοιπὸν τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιγινομένης, ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἐπεισελθὼν [al. ἐκεισελθόντες,] τὸν κλῆρον ἅπαντα τὸν σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς βίαν ἐξέβαλον, καὶ ὅπλοις τὸ βῆμα περιεστοίχιστο· καὶ γυναῖκες τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἴκων πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα ἀποδυσάμεναι κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν, γυμναὶ ἔφυγον ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου τῆς χαλεπῆς ταύτης ἐφόδου, οὐδὲ τὴν πρέπουσαν γυναιξὶν εὐσχημοσύνην συγχωρούμεναι περιθέσθαι· πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ τραύματα δεξάμεναι ἐξεβάλλοντο, καὶ αἵματος αἱ κολυμβῆθραι ἐπληροῦντο, καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἀπὸ τῶν αἱμάτων ἐφοινίσσετο νάματα.

[59] Vit. Chrysost. c. 9. (ap. Oper. Chrysost. t. 13. p. 34 b.) Παρατείνουσι γὰρ τὸν λαὸν ἐν τοῖς μέρεσιν ἡμῶν ἕως ἀλέκτορος πρώτου, ἔχων Θρᾶκας ξιφήρεις νεοστρατεύτους κατὰ τὸν Ἡσαῦ τετρακοσίους, ἀναιδεῖς περισσῶς, ἐπεπήδησεν αἰφνίδιον κατὰ τὴν νύκτα, σὺν τοῖς ἐπιδεικνύουσι κληρικοῖς καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἱταμῶς, ὡς ἄτε λύκος, σιδήρῳ στίλβοντι διασχίσας τοὺς ὄχλους· χωρήσας δ' ἔνδον τῶν μακαρίων ὑδάτων ἐπὶ κωλύσει τῶν μυουμένων τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος, καὶ τῷ μὲν διακόνῳ θρασέως ἐντιναχθεὶς τὰ σύμβολα ἐκχέει· τοὺς δὲ πρεσβυτέρους ἤδη που καὶ ἡλικιώτας ῥοπάλοις κατὰ κρανίου παίσας, αἵματι κιρνᾷ τὴν κολυμβήθραν. Τότε ἦν ἰδεῖν τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ἐκείνην νύκτα, ἐν ᾗ καὶ δαίμονες πίπτουσι ἐπτηχότες, εἰς λαβύρινθον μεταβληθεῖσαν· γυμναὶ γὰρ γυναῖκες σὺν τοῖς ἀνδράσι δρασμῷ ἐχρῶντο, φόβῳ τοῦ σφαγῆναι ἢ ἀσχημονῆσαι, τὸν ἀσχήμονα ἀσπαζόμεναι δρόμον.

[60] Ibid. (d.) Τῇ ἐπαύριον γοῦν ἐξελθὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς, τοῦ γυμνασθῆναι ἐν τῷ παρακειμένῳ πεδίῳ, εἶδεν τὴν ἄσπερον γῆν, τὴν περὶ τὸ Πέμπτον, λευχειμονοῦσαν· καὶ ἐκπλαγεὶς ἐπὶ τῇ θέᾳ τοῦ ἄνθους τῶν νεοφωτίστων. ἦσαν γὰρ ἀμφὶ τοὺς τρισχιλίους. ᾔρετο παρὰ τῶν δορυφόρων, Τίς ἡ λογὰς τῶν ἐκεῖ συνηθροισμένων, κ. τ. λ.

they never had before, and both in order to participate of the holy eucharist on Easter day.

So we have seen the whole practice of the Church from first to last in relation to the observation of Lent, or the first great anniversary fast of forty days.

CHAP. II.

Of the fasts of the four seasons, of monthly fasts, and the original of Ember weeks and Rogation days.

1. THE next anniversary fasting days were those which were called *jejunia quatuor temporum, the fasts of the four seasons of the year.* These were called the fasts of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months, or the fasts of the Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter, observed in March, June, September, and December, which were accounted the beginning of the four several seasons of the year. These were at first designed not to be the seasons of ordination, but to beg a blessing of God upon the several seasons of the year, or to return thanks for the benefits received in each of them, or to exercise and purify both body and soul in a more particular manner at the return of these certain terms of stricter discipline and more extraordinary devotion.

The fast o March, or the first month, th same with the Lent fast.

One of the first that speaks formally of these fasts, under the name and number of *the four seasons,* is Pope Leo, in his Sermons about the year 450, in one of which he thus recounts them[61]: 'The ecclesiastical fasts are so distributed through the whole year, that there is a law of abstinence affixed to all the four seasons. For we keep the Spring fast in Lent, the Summer fast in Pentecost, the Autumnal fast in the seventh month, and the Winter fast in the tenth month.' In another place[62]

[61] Serm. 8. [al. 19. c. 1.] de Jejun. Dec. Mens. (t. 1. p. 59.)..... Quæ [jejunia ecclesiastica] ex doctrina Sancti Spiritus ita per totius anni circulum distributa sunt, ut lex abstinentiæ omnibus sit ascripta temporibus: si quidem jejunium vernum in Quadragesima, æstivum in Pentecoste, autumnale in mense septimo, hyemale autem in hoc, qui est decimus, celebramus.

[62] Serm. 7. [al. 18. c. 1.] de Jejun. Dec. Mens. (ibid. p. 55.) Præsidia [militiæ Christianæ] sanctificandis mentibus nostris atque corporibus divinitus instituta, ideo cum dierum temporumque curriculis sine cessatione reparantur, ut infirmitatum nostrarum ipsa nos medicina commoneat.—Serm. 9. [al. 94. c. 3.] de Jejun. Sept. Mens. p. 88. (t. 1. p. 365.) Ideo enim ipsa continentiæ

he says, 'These fasts are incessantly renewed with the course of days and times, that the medicinal power of them may put us in mind of our infirmities.' Philastrius[63] also speaks of four noted annual fasts kept by the Church in the course of the year: but instead of the fast of September he puts the fast of Epiphany[64], reckoning them in this order: 'The Church celebrates four fasts in the year; the first before the Nativity, the second before the Pasch, the third before Epiphany, and the fourth in Pentecost.' So that these four fasts were not exactly the same in the time of Philastrius that they were in the time of Pope Leo. The Spring fast, or the fast before Easter, is evidently the Lent fast, of which we have spoken before; for as yet there was no particular week in Lent set aside for ordinations, to make a distinct fast of it, as we shall see hereafter.

The fast of Pentecost. 2. The fast of Pentecost, which Leo calls *the Summer fast*, is mentioned also by Athanasius: for in his Apology to Constantius[65] he says, 'the people in the week after the holy Pentecost, having finished their fast, went to pray in the

observantia quatuor est assignata temporibus, ut in id ipsum totius anni redeunte decursu cognosceremus, non indesinenter purificationibus indigere; semperque esse nitendum, dum hujus vitæ varietate jactamur, ut peccatum, quod fragilitate carnis et cupiditatum pollutione contrahitur, jejuniis atque eleemosynis deleatur.

[63] Hær. 97. [al. 121. de Zechar.] ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 4. p. 48. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 514 d.) Per annum quatuor jejunia in ecclesia celebrantur. In Natali primum, deinde in Pascha, tertium in Epiphania, quartum in Pentecoste. . . . . Ab Ascensione inde usque ad Pentecosten diebus decem.

[64] [This statement, that Philastrius puts the fast of Epiphany instead of the fast of September, is incorrect: he puts it instead of the Summer fast in May, meaning *the Ascension*. This is quite clear from what follows in Philastrius, and will be still more so if we may correct a reading, which is obviously false, and which led our Author into error. The whole passage is as follows: Nam per annum quatuor jejunia in ecclesia celebrantur: in Natali primum, deinde in Pascha, tertium in Epiphania, [legendum? Ascensione,] quartum in Pentecoste. Nam in Natali Salvatoris Domini jejunandum est, deinde in Paschæ quadragesima, atque in Ascensione itidem in cœlum post Pascha die quadragesimo, inde usque ad Pentecosten diebus decem: id quod postea fecerunt beati Apostoli post ascensionem, &c. Now, from what is said in the latter part of the context about the four seasons of fasting, it is evident that in the former clauses we should read *Ascensione* for *Epiphania*. See what Fabricius says in his note on the place, (c. 145.) in his edition of Philastrius de Hæresibus, Hamburg. 1721. 12mo. Ed.]

[65] Apol. de Fug. t. 1. p. 704. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 256 b.) Τῇ γὰρ ἑβδομάδι μετὰ τὴν ἁγίαν Πεντηκοστὴν ὁ λαὸς νηστεύσας ἐξῆλθε περὶ τὸ κοιμητήριον εὔξασθαι.

cemetery or churchyard.' The Council of Girone[65] in Spain fixes this to the week after Pentecost, so that after the solemnity of that festival was over, a three days' fast was to be kept on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday in the week immediately following. The second Council of Tours[66] appoints the whole week after Pentecost to be kept an exact fast by those of the monastic life. But whether this was in the week following Whitsunday, or the week after that, appears not from those canons. Neither were these fasts of the four seasons so fixed to any certain week, but that they sometimes varied a week or more in their observation, as appears from the Council of Salegunstade[67], which gives particular directions how to order and accommodate these variations. And in one of our English Councils held at Oxford[68], under Stephen Langton, anno 1222, which settles the fast of the four seasons, it is intimated that the fast of Pentecost was differently observed by many: for some kept it in the week after the Litanies, or Rogation-days, and others in the week of Pente-

[65] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 1568 a.) ... Ut expleta solemnitate Pentecostes, in sequenti septimana, a quinta feria [usque] in Sabbatum, per hoc triduum abstinentia celebretur.

[66] C. 18. [al. 17.] (t. 5. p. 856 e.) ... Post quinquagesimam tota hebdomada exacte jejunent.

[67] Anno 1022. c. 2. (t. 9. p. 845 b.) De incerto autem jejunio quatuor temporum hanc certitudinem statuimus, ut si Kalendæ Martii in quarta feria sive antea evenerint, eadem hebdomada jejunium celebretur. Si autem Kalendæ Martii in quintam feriam aut sextam aut Sabbatum distenduntur, in sequentem hebdomadam jejunium differatur. Simili quoque modo si Kalendæ Junii in quartam feriam, aut antea evenerint, in subsequente hebdomada jejunium celebretur. Et si in quintam feriam aut sextam aut Sabbatum contigerint, jejunium in tertiam hebdomadam reservetur. Et hoc sciendum est, quod si quando jejunium mensis Junii in vigilia Pentecostes secundum prædictam regulam evenerit, non ibi celebrandum erit, sed in ipsa hebdomada solemni Pentecostes: et tunc propter solemnitatem Spiritus Sancti, diaconus dalmaticis induatur, et Alleluia! cantetur, et, Flectamus genua! non dicatur. Eodem modo de Septembris jejunio constitutum est, ut si Kalendæ Septembris in quarta feria evenerint, aut antea, jejunium in tertia hebdomada celebretur: et si in quinta aut sexta aut Sabbato contigerit, in quarta hebdomada jejunandum erit. In Decembri illud observandum erit, ut proximo Sabbato ante vigiliam Natalis Domini celebretur jejunium: quia si vigilia in Sabbato evenerit, simul vigiliam et jejunium celebrare non convenit.

[68] C. 8. (t. 11. p. 275 e.) In Martio prima hebdomada jejunandum est feria quarta et sexta et Sabbato. In Junio in secunda, quod dupliciter observatur a pluribus, in prima hebdomada ..... Pentecostes. In Septembri per tres dies. In proxima septimana integra ante Natalem Domini.

cost. Which shows that there was no universal rule or tradition about this fast in the Church.

The fast of the seventh month, or the Autumnal fast.

3. The fast of the seventh month, or the Autumnal fast, is not so much as mentioned by Philastrius, [as cited in the preceding section,] nor any other writer that I know of, before Pope Leo. But after him Gelasius[68] speaks of it as one of the four solemn times of ordination, which were always accompanied with fasting from the time that they were first introduced into the Church: but this was not till after the time of Pope Leo[69]: for though he often speaks of the fast of September, or the seventh month, yet he never so much as intimates that it was a stated time of ordination, but assigns other reasons for it, because it was fit men should purge themselves from sin at the return of every various season of the year.

The Advent or Nativity fast, called the fast of December, or the tenth month.

4. The fast of December, or the tenth month, by some called the Advent or Nativity fast, is mentioned by Philastrius[70] as one of the four solemn fasts of the Church. This fast anciently was kept from the festival of St. Martin till Christmas-day, three days in the week, Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, as we find in the first Council of Mascon[71], which orders 'that it should be observed after the manner of Lent,' that is, that the oblation should not be celebrated on those days, 'and that the Canons should be read at this time, that no one might pretend ignorance for the non-observance of them.' The second Council of Tours[72] appoints the monks to fast every day during this season. But in the Councils of Salegunstade[73]

[68] Ep. 9. ad Episcopos Lucaniæ. c. 11. (CC. t. 4. p. 1191 c.) Ordinationes presbyterorum et diaconorum, nisi certis temporibus et diebus exercere non debent, id est, quarti mensis jejunio, septimi et decimi, sed et etiam Quadragesimalis initii ac mediana Quadragesimæ die, Sabbati jejunio circa vesperam noverint celebrandas.

[69] Serm. 9. de Jejun. Sept. Mens. p. 88. See s. 1., the second part of n. 62, preceding.

[70] See ibid. n. 63, as well as the remarks in n. 64, preceding.

[71] C. 9. (t. 5. p. 968 e.) Ut a feria Sancti Martini usque ad Natalem Domini secunda, quarta et sexta Sabbati jejunetur, et sacrificia quadragesimali ordine celebrentur. In quibus diebus canones legendos esse sancimus, ut nullus fateatur se per ignorantiam deliquisse.

[72] C. 18. [al. 17.] (ibid. p. 856 e.) De Decembri usque ad Natalem Domini omni die jejunent.

[73] C. 2. (t. 9. p. 845 d.) In Decembri illud observandum erit, ut proximo Sabbato ante vigiliam Natalis Domini celebretur jejunium.

and Oxford[73] this fast is reduced to the week immediately before Christmas.

5. Besides these fasts at the four seasons, Philastrius mentions a fast before Epiphany, or rather, as has been observed before[74], put it in the room of the fast of September. The second Council of Tours takes notice of this, and tells us[75] it was a fast of three days, and that it was appointed particularly at that time in opposition to the Heathen festivals, which they were used to observe with a great deal of corruption and licentious revellings for three days together; which 'three days therefore the fathers rather chose to make days of abstinence and private litanies, to restrain the people from running into the extravagant riots and excesses of the Heathen.' So that New Year's day, or Circumcision, was rather kept as a fast, than a festival, for several ages in the Church. For it appears from the foresaid Council, that the Kalends of January were included in the three days, which was called *the Epiphany fast.* **The fasts at Epiphany.**

6. In some places they had also monthly fasts throughout the year, except in the two months of July and August. Thus it was in Spain by an order of the Council of Eliberis[76], which orders, 'that extraordinary fasts should be celebrated every month, except those two, because of the sickliness of the season.' That these were something more than the ordinary fasts of Wednesday and Friday seems evident from the name that is given them of *fasts of superposition,* which in this place denotes not the length of the fast, but the newness of the imposition, as Albaspinæus[77] observes upon the place; though what sorts of fasts they were is not very easy to **Of monthly fasts.**

[73] C. 8. ut supra. See the last clause of n. 67, preceding.

[74] See s. 1, as well as n. 63 and n. 64, preceding.

[75] C. 18. [al. 17.] (t. 5. p. 856 e. ult. lin.) ... Inter Natalem [al. Natale] Domini et Epiphaniam omni die festivitates sunt. Excipitur triduum illud, quo ad calcandam Gentilium consuetudinem, patres nostri statuerunt privatas in Kalendis Januarii fieri litanias, &c.

[76] C. 23. (t. 1. p. 973 c.) Jejuniorum superpositiones per singulos menses placuit celebrari, exceptis diebus duorum mensium Julii et Augusti, ob eorundem infirmitatem.

[77] [In loc. (ibid. 993 d.) *Jejunia superponere* est jejunia de novo imponere et indicere: quæ autem fuerint illa jejunia, quæ singulis mensibus, præter stationes feriæ sextæ et Sabbati, superimposita essent in Hispania, non facile est dicere, cum ea peculiari quadam lege et consuetudine celebrarentur in illa provincia. *Grischov.*]

determine. If I may be allowed to conjecture in an obscure matter, I should conclude *this superposition of fasts* was the addition of Monday to Wednesday and Friday, because we find it so in one of the French Councils[78], which, ordering the manner of fasting in several months of the year for those of the ascetic life, appoints them to fast three times a week, viz. on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, from Pentecost till August; and so again for the months of September, October, and November. But August is excepted, because in this month every day almost was celebrated as the festival of some martyr[79], with the *manication*, or *morning service* proper to a festival. Besides that the Council of Eliberis itself, in another canon[80], introducing the Saturday fast into Spain, which before was used to be a festival, for that reason calls it *a fast of superposition*, because it was newly taken into use in Spain, after the example of the Church at Rome. But if this conjecture about monthly and superpository fasts be not satisfactory, every reader is at liberty to judge for himself upon better light and information.

The original of the four Ember weeks, or ordination fasts.

7. Some think the Ember weeks, or ordination fasts, were the same with the fasts of the four seasons, and therefore commonly take it for granted, that what proves the one, proves the other also. But I have formerly had occasion to show[81], that for several ages there were no certain times of ordination settled by the Church, but that she ordained persons to all offices and degrees at any times, as the necessity of affairs required. And when the fasts of the four seasons were first instituted, they were appointed for other ends, and not upon the account of ordinations: because the ordinations in the Church of Rome were still performed in December only, after

[78] C. Turon. 2. c. 18. [al. 17.] (t. 5. p. 856.) Post Quinquagesimam tota hebdomada ex asse [al. exacte] jejunent. Postea usque ad Kalendas Augusti ter in septimana jejunent secunda, quarta et sexta die, exceptis his, qui aliqua infirmitate constricti sunt. In Augusto, quia quotidie missæ sanctorum sunt, prandium habeant. In Septembri toto et Octobri et Novembri, sicut prius dictum est, ter in septimana.

[79] Ibid. c. 19. [al. 18.] (p. 857 b.) Toto Augusto manicationes fiant, quia festivitates sunt et missæ. [See before, b. 13. ch. 13. s. 9. v. 4. p. 549., where the term *manicationes* is explained by Mabillon, out of Aimoinus, as meaning *the early matins*, or *morning service, without any psalms*. Ed.]

[80] C. 26. (t. 1. p. 973 d.) Errorem placuit corrigi, ut omni Sabbati die [jejuniorum] superpositionem celebremus.

[81] B. 4. ch. 6. s. 6. v. 2. p. 82.

the fasts of the four seasons were in use, till Simplicius, about the year 467, added February to December. This is noted by Amalarius Fortunatus, as I have shown before [82], and Mr. Wharton [83] tells us, he found the same remark made by Ivo Carnotensis in a manuscript book of his Ecclesiastical Offices. The Council of Mentz [84], in the time of Charles the Great, mentions the fasts of the four seasons, and fixes them to the first week in March, the second week in June, the third week in September, and the week in December that comes immediately before Christmas-day; but yet says nothing of their being Ember weeks, or the fasts of ordination. And some think Gregory VII. was the first that ordered the ordination fasts and the fasts of the four seasons to concur exactly together; before which time, as the seasons of ordination were arbitrary and moveable, so were the fasts that depended on them, which were always of use in the Church, though not always fixed to four certain seasons.

The original of the Rogation fast.

8. About the middle of the fifth century there was a new fast begun in France by Mamercus, Bishop of Vienna, under the name of *the Litany* [*Litanies*], or *Rogation days*, which were the three days immediately before Ascension-day, in the middle of Pentecost. The affixing of a fast to these days was altogether new, because heretofore the whole fifty days of Pentecost were one entire festival, and all fasting and kneeling were prohibited at this time, as has been shown in the last Book [85]. Supplications or litanies were in use before upon extraordinary occasions, but Mamercus was the first that fixed them to these days: and many Churches in the West followed his example, as Sidonius Apollinaris [86] informs us.

[82] De Offic. Eccles. l. 2. c. 1. See b. 4. ch. 6. s. 6. v. 2. p. 84. n. 26.

[83] Auctar. ad Usser. Hist. Dogmat. de Scriptura et Sacris Vernaculis. (p. 363.) See ibid. at the end of n. 26.

[84] C. 34. De Quatuor Temporibus observandis. (t. 7. p. 1249 e.) Constituimus, ut quatuor tempora anni ab omnibus cum jejunio observentur, id est, in mense Martio hebdomada prima: et feria quarta et sexta et Sabbato veniant omnes ad ecclesiam, hora nona, cum litaniis ad missarum solemnia. Similiter in mense Junio hebdomada secunda, feria quarta et sexta et Sabbato jejunetur usque ad horam nonam, et a carne ab omnibus abstineatur. Similiter in mense Septembrio tertia, et in mense Decembrio hebdomada, quæ fuerit plena ante vigiliam Natalis Domini, sicut est in Romana ecclesia traditum.

[85] B. 20. ch. 6. s. 3. p. 331.

[86] L. 5. Ep. 14. (p. 352.) Quidquid illud est, quod vel otio, vel negotio vacas, in urbem tamen .... rogationum contemplatione revocabere: quorum nobis solemnitatem

But the Spanish Churches chose rather to stick by the old custom of keeping Pentecost an entire festival: and therefore the Council of Girone [87] ordered 'that this fast of the Rogation days should rather be kept in the week after Pentecost, and appointed another such Litany or Rogation fast to be kept on the Kalends or first day of November,' which is now become the festival of All Saints transferred from Trinity Sunday. The fifth and sixth Councils of Toledo [88] appointed another Litany fast to be kept on the Ides or thirteenth day of December. And the seventeenth Council of Toledo, anno 694, made a more general decree [89], 'that such Litanies or

primus Mamercus pater, et pontifex, reverentissimo exemplo, utilissimo experimento, invenit, instituit, invexit. Erant quidem prius (quod salva fidei pace sit dictum) vagæ, tepentes, infrequentesque, utque sic dixerim, obscitabundæ supplicationes, quæ sæpe interpellantium prandiorum obicibus hebetabantur, maxime aut imbres, aut serenitatem deprecaturæ, ad quas (ut nihil amplius dicam) figulo pariter atque hortulano non oportuit convenire. In his autem, quas suprafatus summus sacerdos nobis et protulit pariter et contulit, jejunatur, oratur, psallitur, fletur.—L. 7. Ep. 1. ad Mamercum. (p. 409.) Solo invectarum te auctore Rogationum palpamur auxilio, quibus inchoandis instituendisque populus Arvernus, etsi non effectu pari, affectu certe non impari cœpit initiari.

[87] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 1568 a.) De litania, ut, expleta solemnitate Pentecostes, sequens septimana, a quinta feria usque in Sabbatum, per hoc triduum abstinentia celebretur.—C. 3. (ibid. b.) Item secundæ litaniæ faciendæ sunt Kalendis Novembris, ea tamen conditione servata, ut si iisdem diebus Dominica intercesserit, in alia hebdomada, secundum prioris abstinentiæ observantiam, a quinta feria incipiantur, et in Sabbati vespere [al. Sabbato] missa facta finiantur. Quibus tamen diebus a carnibus et a vino abstinendum decrevimus.

[88] Tolet. 5. c. 1. (t. 5. p. 1735 e.) Scilicet ut in cuncto regno a Deo sibi concesso specialis et propria hæc religiosa omni tempore teneatur observantia, ut a die Iduum Decembrium litaniæ triduo usque [al. ubique] annua successione peragantur, et indulgentia delictorum lacrymis impetretur, &c.—Tolet. 6. (ibid. p. 1742 d.) . . . . . Universalis auctoritate censemus concilii, ut hi dies litaniarum, qui in synodo præmissa sunt instituti, eodem in tempore, quo jussi sunt excoli, annuo recursu omni observatione habeantur celeberrimi, ut pro illis, quibus nunc usque simul implicati sumus delictis, sit nostra expiatio ante oculos Dei Omnipotentis.

[89] C. Tolet. c. 6. (t. 6. p. 1367 b.) Quanquam priscorum patrum institutio, per totum annum, per singulorum mensium cursum, litaniarum vota decreverit persolvenda, nec tamen specialiter pro quibus causis id ipsum sit peragendum, tamen, quia cooperante humani generis adversario, multa inolevit oberrandi consuetudo, et jurisjurandi transgressio, ideo secundum Evangelistam, qui ait, *Vigilate et orate, ne intretis in tentationem*, in commune statuentes decernimus, ut deinceps per totum annum, in cunctis duodecim mensibus, per universas Hispaniæ et Galliarum provincias, pro statu ecclesiæ Dei, pro incolumitate principis nostri, atque salvatione populi, et indulgentia totius peccati, et a cunctorum fidelium cordibus expulsione Diaboli, exomologesis vo-

Rogations should be used in every month throughout the year.' And under this head of monthly fasts, we may conclude that the Rogation fast of Pentecost, though not received at first, might perhaps come at last to be admitted in the Spanish Churches: which yet is not indisputably certain, because Walafridus Strabo [90], who lived a whole age after this Council, observes of them, 'that they refused to keep any fast in Pentecost, but put it off till afterward, because it is written [91], "The children of the bridechamber cannot fast, so long as the bridegroom is with them."' But whether he made this observation of the Spanish Church as it was in his own time, or as it was in former times when the Council of Girone forbad all fasting in Pentecost, is a little doubtful: and therefore I content myself with bare hinting the thing here [92], and leave it as a matter under dispute, that may admit of further inquiry. For the Greek Church the thing seems more uncontested, that they never had any Rogation fast in the time of Pentecost. For besides the silence of all the ancient Greek writers about it, Leo Allatius [93], who was originally a Greek, assures us, 'that the present Greek Church knows nothing of the three Rogation days before Ascension; neither have they any stated fasts between Easter and Pentecost, no not so much as the half-fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, which were observed as stationary days in all other parts of the year.' And both he [94] and Gretser [95] reprove those who ascribe the obser-

tis gliscentibus celebrentur: quatenus dum generalem Omnipotens Dominus afflictionem perspexerit, et delictis omnibus miseratus indulgeat, et sævientis Diaboli incitamenta ab animis omnium procul efficiat.

[90] De Offic. Eccles. c. 28. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 15. p. 198 a. 4.) Hispani autem propter hoc, quod scriptum est, *Non possunt filii sponsi lugere, quamdiu cum illis est sponsus*, infra Quinquagesimam Paschæ recusantes jejunare, litanias suas post Pentecosten posuerunt, quinta, sexta, et septima feriis ejusdem hebdomadis, eas facientes.

[91] [See Matth. 9, 15. Mark 2, 19. Luke 5, 34. Ed.]

[92] See more of this Rogation fast, b. 13. ch. 1. s. 10. v. 4. p. 279.

[93] De Dominicis et Hebdomadibus Græcor. n. 23. (p. 1456.) Rogationes triduanæ ante Ascensionem Domini Græcis ignotæ sunt, nec ulla habent stata jejunia inter Pascha et Pentecosten.... Immo vero, cum in aliis hebdomadis feria quarta et sexta jejunium præcipiatur, ea jejunia iis etiam feriis solvere concessum est.

[94] [Ibid. (p. 1456.) Nomen [διακαινησίμου] habuit ex sanctissimo resurrectionis Christi triumpho, quo omnia renovantur, instaurantur, et meliorem in statum reducuntur. Hinc apparet, quantum aberrent ii, qui nullo veterum scriptorum testimonio fido διακοινήσιμον scribunt; multoque enormius, qui διακενίσιμον, quasi diceres *exinanitioni* dicatum, quia per illud tempus exina-

vation of the Rogation fast to them, upon a mistaken ground, as if the word διακαινήσιμος, which signifies the week after Easter, or the week of *renovation*, was to be read, διακενίσιμος, the week of *maceration* or *fasting*, supposing it to be the week of the Rogation fast, when indeed there never was any such fast in use among them. So that as this fast was of no long standing in the Western Church, nor universally received there, so it is plain the Eastern Church knew nothing of it, but always kept Pentecost an entire festival, according to the ancient and general rule of the Church.

CHAP. III.

Of the weekly fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, or the stationary days of the ancient Church.

The original of these fasts.

1. THUS far we have considered the annual fasts of the ancient Church, which were kept at their stated times in the revolution of every year. Beside these they had their weekly fasts on Wednesdays and Fridays, called *the stationary days*, and *half-fasts*, and *fasts of the fourth and sixth days of the week*, by the Latins *feria quarta et sexta*, and by the Greeks τετρὰς καὶ παρασκευή. These are certainly as ancient as the time of Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian. For Clemens, describing his Gnostic, or perfect Christian, says [1], 'He under-

niunt sua corpora et macerant, oraturi Deum pro commoditate anni, et volunt esse hebdomadem rogationum; quos optime refellit Gretserus in Codinum, l. 3. c. 9.

[95] In Codin. Observat. l. 3. c. 9. (ap. Corp. Byzant. Scriptor. t. 2. p. 212.) Male .... Junius in notis interpretatur ἑβδομάδα διακαινησίμου. Male etiam rationem nominis reddens, ait, eam dici, διακενίσιμον, *exinanitioni dictam, quia per illud tempus exinaniunt sua corpora et macerant, oraturi Deum pro commoditate anni.* Primum, non scribendum διακενίσιμος, sed διακαινήσιμος, ut habent exemplaria Alexandri, Rituales Libri Græcorum, et Codex Bibliothecæ Augustanæ MS. quo continentur Evangelia, diebus sacris prælegi solita, quorum initium, Τῇ τρίτῃ τῆς διακαινησίμου. Quocirca hebdomas τῆς διακαινησίμου dicitur, quasi *septimana renovationis*, τοῦ διακαινισμοῦ, quum, Christo resurgente, omnia renovata et instaurata fuerint. Secundo, tantum abest, ut hæc hebdomas ab exinanitione jejunantiumque inedia nomen invenerit, ut tota illa hebdomade jejunium solvere moris fuerit. Testis Balsamon (in Can. 59. Apost.) qui, cum percensuisset dies quibus jejunandum est, excipit quartos dies, et Parasceues seu ferias sextas, quæ sunt πρὸ τῆς ἀποκρέου, seu ἀπόκρεω, ante carnisprivium: et quæ sunt πρὸ τῆς τυροφάγου, et hebdomadem τῆς διακαινησίμου.

[1] Stromat. 7. (p. 877. 12.) Οἶδεν αὐτὸς καὶ τῆς νηστείας τὰ αἰνίγματα

stands the mystery of the fasts of the fourth and sixth days, which are called by the names of Mercury and Venus among the Gentiles: he therefore fasts all his life from covetousness and lust:' meaning that those were the peculiar vices of Mercury and Venus among the Heathen. Not long after, Tertullian[2], disputing against some who were against all religious observation of times and seasons, because of those words of the Apostle, (Gal. 4, 5.) "Ye observe days and months and times and years," thus refutes them from the practice and observation of the whole Church: 'If the Apostle has wholly cancelled all observation of times and days, and months and years, why do we celebrate the Pasch in its annual return and revolution? Why do we spend the fifty days after in perpetual joy? Why do we set apart the fourth and sixth days of the week for our stations, and the *Parasceue* (or *Friday*) for our fasts?' In like manner Origen[3], 'We have the forty days of Lent consecrated to fasting: we have the fourth and sixth days of the week on which we observe our solemn fasts.' And Victorinus the Martyr[4], who lived in the latter end of the third century, speaks of both these days as religiously observed with fasting, either till nine o'clock, that is, three in the afternoon, or till evening, or by *a superposition*[5], as they called it, to the next day. And he particularly tells us, they observed Friday as a stationary day, because it was the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. Which is also noted by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, who lived in the same age, and died a martyr a little after in the Diocletian persecution. For thus

τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, τῆς Τετράδος καὶ τῆς Παρασκευῆς, λέγω· ἐπιφημίζονται γὰρ, ἡ μὲν Ἑρμοῦ, ἡ δὲ Ἀφροδίτης· αὐτίκα νηστεύει κατὰ τὸν βίον φιλαργυρίας τε ὁμοῦ καὶ φιληδονίας, ἐξ ὧν αἱ πᾶσαι ἐκφύονται κακίαι.

[2] De Jejun. c. 14. (p. 552 b.)... Si omnem in totum devotionem temporum et dierum et mensium et annorum erasit Apostolus, cur Pascha celebramus in annuo circulo, in mense primo? cur quinquaginta exinde diebus in omni exultatione decurrimus? cur stationibus quartam et sextam sabbati dicamus, et jejuniis Parasceuen?

[3] Hom. 10. in Levit. t. 1. p. 159. (t. 2. p. 246 d.) Habemus Quadragesimæ dies jejuniis consecratos. Habemus quartam et sextam septimanæ dies, quibus solemniter jejunamus.

[4] De Fabrica Mundi. (ap. Cave, Hist. Liter. t. 1. p. 103.) Nunc ratio veritatis ostenditur, quare dies quartus *Tetras* nuncupatur; quare usque ad horam nonam jejunamus, usque ad vesperam, aut superpositio usque in alterum diem fiat... Sextus dies *Parasceue* appellatur: hoc quoque die ob passionem Domini Jesu Christi, aut stationem Deo, aut jejunium facimus.

[5] See ch. 1. s. 25. p. 425.

he speaks in one of his Canons[6]: 'Let no one blame us for observing the fourth day of the week, and the *parasceue*, or *day of preparation*, (viz. Friday, or the sixth day,) on which days we have a rational appointment to fast from ancient tradition: on the fourth day, because the Jews conspired to betray our Lord; and on the preparation, or sixth day, because then our Lord suffered for us.'

The reasons of their institution

2. Many other such testimonies occur in the writers of the fourth and following ages, St. Basil[7], St. Jerom[8], St. Austin[9], Epiphanius[10], and the authors of the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions[12]: but those already alleged are most pertinent to show the antiquity of the observation. Some derive the original of these fasts from apostolical institution. So Epiphanius and the author of the Constitutions; which, as a learned person[13] rightly observes, 'is a good argument of their antiquity,

[6] C. 15. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 2. part 1. p. 23. (CC. t. 1. p. 968 c.) Οὐκ ἐγκαλέσει τις ἡμῖν παρατηρουμένοις Τετράδα καὶ Παρασκευὴν, ἐν αἷς καὶ νηστεύειν ἡμῖν κατὰ παράδοσιν εὐλόγως προσετέτακτο· τὴν μὲν γὰρ Τετράδα διὰ τὸ γενόμενον συμβούλιον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ τῇ παραδοσίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου, τὴν δὲ Παρασκευὴν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔπαθε, κ. τ. λ.

[7] Ep. 289. [al. 93.] ad Cæsar. Patric. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 267 d.) Ἡμεῖς μέν τοιγε τέταρτον καθ' ἑκάστην ἑβδομάδα κοινωνοῦμεν· ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ, ἐν τῇ Τετράδι, καὶ ἐν τῇ Παρασκευῇ, καὶ τῷ Σαββάτῳ.

[8] In Gal. 4. (t. 7. p. 456 d.) Si dies observare non licet, et menses, et tempora, et annos, nos quoque simile crimen incurrimus, quartam sabbati observantes, et Parasceuen, &c.

[9] Ep. 86. [al. 36.] ad Casulan. (t. 2. pp. 68, seqq.) See also n. 14, following.

[10] Hær. 75. Aërian. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 910 b.) Τίνι δὲ οὐ συμπεφώνηται ἐν πᾶσι κλίμασι τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὅτι Τετρὰς καὶ Προσάββατον νηστεία ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὡρισμένη; Εἰ δὲ καὶ χρὴ τὸ τῆς διατάξεως τῶν Ἀποστόλων λέγειν, πῶς ἐκεῖ ὡρίζοντο Τετράδα, καὶ Προσάββατον νηστείαν διὰ παντὸς, χωρὶς Πεντηκοστῆς;—Expos. Fid. n. 22. (t. 1. p. 1104 c, d.) Συνάξεις δὲ ἐπιτελούμεναι ταχθεῖσαί εἰσιν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, Τετράδι, καὶ Προσαββάτῳ, καὶ Κυριακῇ. Τετράδι δὲ καὶ ἐν Προσαββάτῳ ἐν νηστείᾳ ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης· ἐπειδήπερ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ Τετράδι συνελήφθη ὁ Κύριος, καὶ τῷ Προσαββάτῳ ἐσταυρώθη, καὶ παρέδωκαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἐν ταύταις νηστείας ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, πληρουμένου τοῦ ῥητοῦ, Ὅτι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. . . . . Καὶ δι' ὅλου μὲν τοῦ ἔτους ἡ νηστεία φυλάττεται ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἁγίᾳ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, φημὶ δὲ Τετράδι καὶ Προσαββάτῳ, ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης, δίχα μόνης τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ὅλης τῶν πεντήκοντα ἡμερῶν, ἐν αἷς οὔτε γονυκλισίαι γίνονται, οὔτε νηστεία προστέτακται.

[11] C. 69. See before, ch. 1. s. 14. p. 409. n. 75.

[12] L. 5. c. 15. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 319.) Τετράδα δὲ καὶ Παρασκευὴν προσέταξεν ἡμῖν νηστεύειν· τὴν δὲ διὰ τὴν προδοσίαν, τὴν δὲ διὰ τὸ πάθος.—L. 7. c. 23. (ibid. p. 369.) Αἱ δὲ νηστεῖαι ὑμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν· νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρᾳ σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτῃ· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἢ τὰς πέντε νηστεύσατε ἡμέρας, ἢ Τετράδα καὶ Παρασκευήν.

[13] Beveridge: Cod. Can. Vindicat. l. 3. c. 10. s. 2. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 171.)

seeing those authors could derive them from no other fountain but apostolical institution.' However, St. Austin does not carry the matter so high, but rather accounts them an appointment of the Church upon reasons taken out of the Gospel. 'This reason,' says he[14], 'may be given why the Church fasts chiefly on the fourth and sixth days of the week, because it appears, upon considering the Gospel, that on the fourth day, which we commonly call *feria quarta*, the Jews took counsel to kill our Lord; and on the sixth day our Lord suffered: for which reason the sixth day is rightly appointed a fast.' Peter, bishop of Alexandria[15], assigns the same reason for the observation of these fasts, and so does the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, and Victorinus Martyr, in the passages already cited[16]. So that whatever original these fasts had in point of time, the Ancients seem generally to agree in the reason of their institution, that they were made fasts in regard to our Saviour's being betrayed and crucified on these days, which the Churches thought proper to be kept in perpetual remembrance, by the return of a weekly observation.

How they differed from the Lent fast and all others in point of duration.

3. But we are to note, that these fasts, being of continual use every week throughout the year, except in the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost, were not kept with that rigour and strictness which was observed in the time of Lent. For the Lent fast, as has been shown before[17], commonly held till evening every day that it was observed: but these weekly fasts ordinarily held no longer than nine o'clock, that is, three in the afternoon, unless any chose voluntarily to protract them till the evening, or by a superposition (as Victorinus Martyr[18] phrases it) extended them to the morning of the next day. And for this reason they are commonly spoken of by the distinguishing names of *stationes et semijejunia, stations and half-fasts;* because on these days they continued the church-

Has autem Constitutiones longe ante Epiphanium exstitisse, ex eo satis patet, quod ab ipso sub Apostolorum nomine laudentur.

[14] Ep. 86. [al. 36.] ad Casulan. c. 13. (p. 80 c.) Cur autem quarta et sexta maxime jejunet ecclesia, illa ratio reddi videtur, quod, considerato Evangelio, ipsa quarta sabbati, quam vulgo quartam feriam vocant, consilium reperiuntur ad occidendum Dominum fecisse Judæi. Intermisso autem uno die,... passus est Dominus, quod nemo ambigit, sexta sabbati: quapropter et ipsa sexta recte jejunio deputatur.

[15] C. 15. See n. 6, preceding.

[16] See nn. 4 and 12, preceding.

[17] See ch. 1. s. 16. p. 411.

[18] See n. 4, preceding.

assemblies till three o'clock in the afternoon, and no longer; whereas a perfect and complete fast was never reckoned to end before evening.

Tertullian often speaks of them under these covert appellations in many places besides that already cited. In one place[17] he styles them *stationum semijejunia, the half-fasts of the stations.* In other places[18] he distinguishes three sorts of abstinence, under the names of *jejunationes, xerophagiæ,* and *stationes.* Where by *jejunationes* he understands *the complete fasts,* which held till evening; by *xerophagiæ,* the abstaining from flesh and *living upon dry meats;* and by *stationes, the fasts till nine o'clock;* which he therefore calls[19] '*officia recusati vel recisi vel retardati pabuli, the offices of wholly refusing meat till evening, or retrenching it to live upon dry meats,* (bread and water), *or retarding the meal till nine o'clock.*' And again[20], 'the bridling of the appetite, *per nullas interdum, vel seras, vel aridas escas,* either by *wholly abstaining* from meat till evening, or by deferring the meal *to a late hour,* (that is, three in the afternoon,) or by abstaining from flesh, and feeding only upon *dry meats,*' (bread and water.) In all which distinctions any one may plainly discern, that the stations and half-fasts are put to denote the weekly fasts of Wednesdays and Fridays, which among the Catholics held only till nine o'clock, though Tertullian and the Montanists pleaded stiffly for having them protracted till the evening, urging a new revelation and authority from the Holy Ghost for such imposition. But the Church kept constant to her ancient practice, continuing these fasts to ~~nine~~ o'clock, and no longer, as appears from the account which Epiphanius[21]

[17] De Jejun. c. 13. See before, ch. 1. s. 2. p. 383. n. 11.

[18] Ibid. c. 1. (p. 544 b.) Arguunt nos, [nempe Psychici] quod jejunia propria custodiamus; quod stationes plerumque in vesperam producamus; quod etiam xerophagias observemus, siccantes cibum ab omni carne, et omni jurulentia, et uvidioribus quibusque pomis; ne quid vinositatis vel edamus vel potemus. —C. 11. (p. 550 b.) Propterea per singulas direximus species jejunationum, xerophagiarum, stationum, ut, dum recensemus secundum utriusque Testamenti paraturam, quantum proficiant recusati vel recisi vel retardati pabuli officia, eos retundamus qui hæc velut vacantia infirmant.

[19] Ibid. c. 11. See the last part of the preceding note.

[20] Ibid. c. 1. (p. 544 a.) . . . Disciplinam . . . gulæ frenos induentem per nullas interdum vel seras vel aridas escas.

[21] Expos. Fid. n. 22. See s. 2, the second part of n. 10, preceding.

gives of them in his own time, speaking of the customs of the Catholic Church: 'On the fourth and sixth days of the week,' says he, 'we continue fasting to the ninth hour.' And again[22], 'On the fourth and sixth days throughout the whole year, except in the fifty days of Pentecost, a fast is kept in the holy Catholic Church to the ninth hour.' And therefore Prudentius[23], describing the passion of Fructuosus, a Spanish bishop and martyr, brings him in thus answering for himself: 'We keep fast to-day, I cannot drink: the ninth hour is not yet come.' Where he plainly refers to the hour of the day, to which these stationary fasts continued. And in another place[24]: 'It is now near the ninth hour, and the sun begins to decline: three parts of the day are scarce ended, and the fourth remains. We now offer up our prayers and receive the eucharist, and then we break off our festival and go to our ordinary refreshment.' In which words *the festival* denotes one of these stationary-days, on which they held religious assemblies in the church, offered up their devotions, received the eucharist, and then at nine o'clock broke up the assembly, and went to their ordinary meal.

With what solemnity they were observed.

4. And hence we learn, that these stationary days were not only observed with fasting, but with religious assemblies, and solemn devotions in the church, with receiving the eucharist, and the usual service of the Lord's-day in all particulars, save that the sermon perhaps was omitted, which was never omitted on the Lord's-day. St. Ambrose, exhorting his hearers to observe the usual fasts of the Church, gives a like account of the service of these stationary days. For the fast of Lent, he exhorts them[25] 'to put off their meal to the end of the day, because that was the regular way of observing Lent; but there were many other days on which they were to come to church

[22] See ibid., the last part of n. 10, preceding.

[23] Peristeph. Hymn. 6. vv. 54, 55. (v. 1. p. 279.) Jejunamus, ait, recuso potum. Nondum nona diem resignat hora.

[24] Id. Cathemer. Hymn. 8. vv. 9—16. (ibid. p. 119.)
Nona submissum rotat hora solem,
Partibus vixdum tribus evolutis,
Quarta devexo superest in axe
Portio lucis.
Nos, brevis voti dape vindicata,
Solvimus festum, fruimurque mensis
Affatim plenis, quibus imbuatur
Plena voluptas.

[25] Serm. in Ps. 118. 62. (t. 1. p. 1073 d. n. 48.) Differ aliquantulum, non longe est finis diei. Immo plerique sunt ejusmodi dies, ut statim meridianis horis adveniendum sit in ecclesiam, canendi hymni, celebranda oblatio.

presently after noon, and sing their hymns, and celebrate the oblation or eucharist, and then their fast was ended.' In which words, as he plainly intimates that the fast of the stationary days was shorter than that of Lent, so he expressly affirms, that on those days they held religious assemblies at church in the afternoon, and there exercised themselves in singing of hymns and receiving the eucharist. Which is the same account as is given by Tertullian, St. Basil, and Socrates, as I have had occasion to note elsewhere[26], only with this difference, that Socrates says, at Alexandria they had sermons on these days, and all the other service of the Church, but not the communion; in which that Church was singular and differing from the practice of all other Churches.

How the Catholics and Montanists disputed about the observation of them.

5. However, this difference in this matter, nor in any other customs and usages of the like nature, raised no dispute in the Catholic Church, because the things were indifferent in themselves, and the Church always practised them with a just regard to Christian liberty, having no express command for them in the word of God. The Church never tied them upon men's consciences as divine injunctions, but only as laudable, ecclesiastical institutions; or, at most, as customs descending from ancient tradition, and, in the opinion of some, from apostolical practice. Therefore, though the greatest persons readily observed them, as Socrates[27] observes of Theodosius Junior, that he fasted often, especially upon Wednesdays and Fridays, which he did with an earnest desire ἄκρως Χριστιανίζειν, *to live up to the height of Christian perfection;* yet if men's infirmities or employments would not suffer them to go so far as others in the observation of these days, a just allowance was made, and no severity of ecclesiastical censure, further than admonition, passed upon them. The clergy, indeed, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and all inferior orders belonging to the Church, are by some Canons[28] obliged to observe these and other fasts, under pain of deposition and degradation: and this was thought not unreasonable, because they had ordinarily no other employ-

[26] B. 13. ch. 9. s. 2. v. 4. p. 525.

[27] L. 7. c. 21. (v. 2. p. 369. 1.) Καρτερὸς δὲ οὕτως ἦν, ὡς καὶ κρύος καὶ καῦμα γενναίως ὑπομένειν· νηστεύειν τέ τὰ πολλὰ, καὶ μάλιστα τὰς καλουμένας Τετράδας καὶ Παρασκευὰς ἡμέρας· καὶ τοῦτο ἐποίει, ἄκρως Χριστιανίζειν ἐσπουδακώς.

[28] Apost. 69. See before, ch. 1. s. 14. p. 409. n. 75.

ment but assiduously to attend the service of the Church. But even this would not satisfy the wild and enthusiastic rigour of the Montanists. For they extended these fasts from morning till evening, and would oblige all men to observe them in that extent, not as ordinary usages and customs of the Church, but as necessary and indispensable divine injunctions, lately given to the world by the new inspiration of the Holy Ghost speaking in their great prophet Montanus; who, as they pretended, had authority from God to give more perfect laws and rules of living to the Church than any that were delivered by the Apostles. This was the dispute between them and the Church, as appears from Tertullian's Book *De Jejuniis, adversus Psychicos, Of Fasting, against the Carnal,* as he slanderously and contumeliously terms the Catholics, whilst he wrote against the Church in defence of the new hypothesis of the Montanists. The dispute was not, whether the Church had an ordinary power to appoint days of fasting proper for her own edification. For this she always claimed and practised, as appears from this whole account that has been given of her fasts; and also from what Tertullian says concerning them[29]: 'that the bishops of the Church, besides the stated and ordinary annual and weekly fasts, were wont sometimes to enjoin their respective charges to observe certain occasional fasts upon emergent necessities of the Church.' But the Montanists pretended to impose their new fasts as divine laws, by special direction of the Holy Ghost. And therefore it was, that Apollonius, an ancient ecclesiastical writer, mentioned by Eusebius[30], charged Montanus as setting up for a lawgiver in imposing fasts. Which *imposing fasts by a law* must import his presuming to command fasts as of necessary obligation by divine precept, and as peculiar dictates from the new pretended inspirations of the Holy Ghost. For otherwise, the bishops of the Church would have been chargeable with the same crime; because it is certain they appointed fasts, both occasional and constant, yet with just liberties of human laws, for the benefit and edification of the Church. And herein, I conceive, consisted the true difference between them.

[29] De Jejun. c. 13. (p. 551 c.) ... Episcopi universæ plebi mandare jejunia assolent ... interdum ex aliqua solicitudinis ecclesiasticæ causa.

[30] L. 5. c. 18. (v. 1. p. 233. 38.) Οὗτός ἐστιν .... ὁ νηστείας νομοθετήσας.

OCT 22 1933